THE ANTI-JACOBIN Review and Magazine,

&c. &c. &c.

For NOVEMBER, 1807.

Certes, if all things were well knowne and view'd,
He doth but champe that which another chew'd;
Honors ſhade thruſts honors ſubſtance from his place:
Tis ſtrange, when ſhade the ſubſtance can diſgrace.
MARSTON, *Scourge of Villanie.*

ORIGINAL CRITICISM.

Oil without Vinegar, and Dignity without Pride; or Britiſh, American, and Weſt India Intereſts conſidered. By Macall Medford, Eſq. 8vo. Pp. 87. Richardſon, London; Dobſon, Philadelphia. 1807.

WE have looked in vain through this book for that Oil without Vinegar, which is quaintly exhibited in the title-page, as its firſt characteriſtic. If the author alluded to that oil which is conſumed in the pale vigils of midnight ſtudy, the alluſion is unappropriate; for his work, ſo far from ſmelling of the lamp, is extremely ſuperficial and incorrect. If he meant, that his ſentiments, like oil poured upon the ſurface, would ſmooth the troubled waves of controverſy and animoſity, he appears by ſome unlucky miſtake to have taken up the wrong jar, and inſtead of oil to have poured out vinegar; for he terms the regulations of the Britiſh Government tyrannical and fooliſh; calls the Britiſh Weſt India merchants blood-ſuckers, and deceivers deſerving of puniſhment; and repreſents both them and the Britiſh ſhip owners as men who miſlead his Majeſty's miniſters and the public, by falſe and intereſted repreſentations. It muſt be admitted, however, that the latter part of the title and the contents of this book coincide moſt admirably, for, in both, American

intereſts are foiſted in between thoſe of Great Britain and the Weſt Indies. We learn from Mr. Medford that he is an American by birth, but that having lived for nearly as long a period in England as he did in his native country, he feels a great attachment to both nations, and, as he thinks, a tolerable degree of impartiality, with a ſtrong deſire of preventing hoſtilities between them; that in this ſpirit he has written this book, and kindly ordered it to be ſold for their mutual edification, by Meſſrs. Richardſons, Cornhill, and Mr. Thomas Dobſon, Philadelphia.

Mr. Medford commences with obſerving, that, by ſome ſtrange fatality, England and the United States of America are on the eve of a rupture. He then aſks, "Why is all this ſo? That is an important queſtion. How can the caſe be altered, and animoſities diminiſhed? This is a more important queſtion ſtill; to which I propoſe to call the attention of the public of both countries." The firſt point, though important, he does not condeſcend to explain; but the ſecond being ſtill more important, he conſiders as worthy of his talents; adopting the Horatian precept, *Nec Deus interſit niſi dignum vindice nodus.* The next page furniſhes a fair ſpecimen of Mr. Medford's ſtyle and mode of reaſoning.

"What is wiſe and advantageous to be done? What is it found equitable to do? and what is practicable? theſe are the great queſtions on every important occaſion. When people are too much biaſſed by intereſt or inflamed by paſſion, they are incapable of making the enquiry, and when reaſon loſes its effect an appeal is made to what the ancient Germans emphatically termed 'the right of the ſiſt;' but let us hope that on the preſent occaſion two free and enlightened nations may ſettle their differences in a wiſer way.

"Enough of blood, enough of ſlaughter's paſt,
And Albion's ſons ſhall have repoſe at laſt.

"Thoſe writers who have with ſuch labour and pains cited authorities, ancient and modern, for and againſt the rights of neutrals, have been of little ſervice to the cauſe—an appeal to the law of nations is not much better, but the law of nature ſcarcely ever will be appealed to in vain."

Thus the rights of neutrals, and the law of nations, are at once excluded from the diſcuſſion, and the law of nature is appealed to. Perhaps Mr. Medford was not aware, that the law of nature conſtitutes the law of nations *(quod naturalis ratio inter omnes homines conſtituit, vocatur jus gentium)*; and that both have their origin in thoſe immutable principles of juſtice, which were impreſſed upon the human mind antecedent to any poſitive precepts. Mr. Medford ſeems to have

borrowed his ideas of the law of nature from Hobbes, and thoſe other writers who conſider man in a ſtate of nature as in a ſtate of warfare, owning no other law than club law, or what Mr. Medford tells us, "the ancient Germans emphatically termed, the right of the fiſt;" which, as he ſays, is ſcarcely ever appealed to in vain, for a knock down blow is certainly a moſt forcible argument. That we have not miſinterpreted his ſentiments, will appear from his own elucidation of them, which we ſhall ſubjoin.

"So long as a convention that is entered into tends to the mutual or ultimate advantage of the parties, they may all join cordially in the meaſure; but the inſtant that the majority find a regulation injurious to them, however juſt it may be, they will endeavour to get rid of it; and on the other hand an unjuſt regulation, if advantageous to the ſtronger party, aſſumes the appearance of law and right.

"Much has been ſaid about the regulations adopted about fifty years ago, but at that time the trade of Europe was pretty equally divided, ſo were colonies and ſettlements both in the Eaſt and Weſt Indies—America did not then exiſt as a nation. Now the caſe is quite altered; the trade of Europe, and the territories in the Eaſt and Weſt Indies, are chiefly monopolized by Britain; ſo that the regulations that agreed with the general intereſt during the ſeven years war, are not now equally beneficial to all nations: the conſequence of this is, that the regulations are invoked by Britain, and exclaimed againſt by all other nations; to enter into arguments on that ſubject, will ſcarcely therefore be of any great utility. Intereſt is too much concerned in the buſineſs, for juſtice to be taken as the guide."

Here it is laid down as a principle, that the ſtronger party, or the majority, will get rid of any regulation the inſtant that it becomes injurious to them: juſtice is abandoned, and intereſt recognized as the ſole rule of action. With theſe impreſſions upon his mind, ſimilar to thoſe entertained by Lewis the XIVth, when he ordered *lex ultima regum* to be engraved upon his cannon, we cannot but feel ſurpriſed that Mr. Medford ſhould ſit down to write a book upon a ſubject, concerning which he expreſſes his conviction, "that arguments will ſcarcely be of any utility."

After his introductory chapter, Mr. Medford proceeds to the diſcuſſion of the three great queſtions between Great Britain and America; citizenſhip, colonial laws, and the rights of neutrals. He ſettles the queſtion of citizenſhip at once, by deciding that allegiance is local as much as the payment of taxes; and that "the only fragment of allegiance which may be ſaid to follow a man into another country, is not to carry arms againſt his ſovereign." He does, however, make

this diſtinction: "I know it may be ſaid, that the caſe of ſeamen is different from that of other men, but whatever the point may be as to right, it is nothing as to importance." With ſubmiſſion to Mr. Medford, we think it of vital importance to the intereſts and even to the exiſtence of the Britiſh empire, that the caſe of ſeamen ſhould be different from that of other men; and therefore it is that every man who engages in a ſeafaring life is bound by the law of the land to give his ſervices to his country whenever they are required; nor can it reaſonably be expected that the flag of America ſhould exempt them from an obligation againſt which the flag of their own country can afford them no protection. On the colonial laws of Great Britain, Mr. Medford offers the following obſervations.

"The colonial laws muſt in all caſes depend on circumſtances, not on what people apprehend to be rights; in the jargon of the day, called *the legal rights of the mother country*, one of which is ſtated upon the general ſcale to be a monopoly of the trade of the colony. Now with the greateſt deference to thoſe high authorities who entertain a different opinion, I will maintain that the mother country has not an unlimited right to monopolize the trade of a colony.

"If ſuch an unlimited right exiſted, the mother country might ſtarve a colony for want of proviſions, and yet do ſo without injuſtice; a thing contrary to the immutable law of God, as well as to thoſe laws of man, which being implanted in the nature of things, do not admit of change."

The legal rights of the mother country are not altogether the jargon of the day, and, putting out of the queſtion ſo very extreme and abſurd a caſe as that of the ſtarving the colonies, ſhe has an undoubted right to monopolize their trade. For this right ſhe pays a valuable conſideration, by giving them her ſupport and protection in return, with the monopoly of her market for the conſumption of their commodities. Writers of all nations, and even of that nation which now in conjunction with America ſeeks to ſubvert this right, have admitted it in the fulleſt extent. Monteſquieu ſays, "It has been eſtabliſhed, that the metropolis or mother country alone ſhall trade in the colonies; and this for very good reaſon, becauſe the deſign of the ſettlement was the extenſion of commerce, not the foundation of a city, or of a new empire. Thus it is ſtill a fundamental law of Europe, that all commerce with a foreign colony ſhall be regarded as a mere monopoly, puniſhable by the laws of the country. The diſadvantage of a colony that loſes the liberty of commerce, is viſibly compenſated by the protection of the mother country,

who defends it by her arms, or ſupports it by her laws*." This right, ſo far from being the jargon of the day, appears to have been coeval with the eſtabliſhment of colonies; it was evidently exerciſed by the Carthaginians; for one of the articles in the treaty which concludes the firſt Punic war ſtipulated that they ſhould allow the Romans a free trade with Sicily, and the other iſlands in the Mediterranean under their dominion. Mr. Medford admits, that "in certain caſes, and to a certain extent, the mother country has a right to regulate the trade of a colony;" and obſerves, that the true enquiry is, "whether the ſubjects in diſpute are without or within the limit that bounds the right of the mother country." He then ſtates the points, and decides upon them thus:

"To have free liberty to exchange produce for produce is the chief part of what is wiſhed by the inhabitants of the iſlands and by the Americans, and this certainly it is not within the power or authority of the mother country to prevent; for, as the mother country cannot rob or ſtarve the colony, ſo likewiſe it has no right to prevent it from trafficking to the beſt advantage, and ſelling its produce as it pleaſes, only obtaining a preference for itſelf upon equal conditions."

Mr. Medford forgets that the monopoly between the mother country and the colonies is reciprocal, and does not attempt to prove his inference, that "as the mother country cannot rob or ſtarve her colonies, ſo likewiſe ſhe has no right to prevent them from trafficking to the beſt advantage." Although the mother country muſt not enforce her rights at the expence of juſtice and humanity, which indeed conſiderations of intereſt alone would prevent her from doing, her own proſperity depending upon that of her colonies, yet ſurely they cannot expect her to relinquiſh ſuch important rights merely for their trifling or temporary advantage. If this principle could be maintained, the moment that Great Britain went to war, and the rate of freight and inſurance in her ſhips was advanced, ſhe muſt relinquiſh her carrying trade to neutral nations, and give up that nurſery for ſeamen which can alone ſupport her naval power, at the very period when the utmoſt exertions of that power became moſt eſſential. Inſtead of arguments on this ſubject, we are preſented with inducements, in the following paſſage.

"If Government would place the Engliſh Weſt India iſlands and ſettlements under a juſt but liberal regulation, the planters would be happy, the iſlands would become rich, and all the differences with

* Spirit of Laws, book xxi, chap. xvii.

America would be at an end, without altering her navigation laws, and Weſt India eſtates would be doubled in value in a few years."

That this conceſſion would be in ſome degree advantageous to the Weſt Indies, and very highly ſo to America, cannot be doubted; but are the maritime, the manufacturing, and the commercial intereſts of Great Britain to be entirely overlooked? The Weſt India merchants are ſeverely ſtigmatized as the cauſe of all the difficulties between Great Britain and America, and of all the diſtreſſes of the Weſt India planters, who are reminded of the advantages they would derive from coaleſcing with, or in plain Engliſh throwing themſelves under the protection of America; an event which Mr. Medford confidently aſſerts "muſt ſome day take place."

The obſervations on the late affair between the Leopard and the Cheſapeak are truly curious.

"With reſpect then to two queſtions, thoſe of citizenſhip, and the commerce of colonies, I think they are clearly decided; but as to the third, prudence and expediency muſt be the guide, for the acting on a principle of what may be termed equality or reciprocity is nonſenſical. As a general rule applicable in particular caſes it may be very well, but before we ſpeak of equality, or reciprocity, we muſt know whether circumſtances make them poſſible. In the preſent inſtance of the Cheſapeak, it is underſtood that the Engliſh Captain had orders to act upon a principle of equality, and to allow his ſhip to be ſearched, at the ſame time that he inſiſted upon ſearching the American for deſerters. This was proper, undoubtedly, but where was the reciprocity?

"The Engliſh Captain knew there were ſome of his men in the other veſſel, and he knew there were no American deſerters in his; the liberty to ſearch him might either be taken as a complimental formality, or as an inſult, for in reality it meant nothing. It brings to my mind a gentleman well known as an eccentric character, who had his pocket picked of his handkerchief in Bond-ſtreet. A paſſenger informed him of his loſs, and pointed out the thief. The enraged gentleman ran in an inſtant, collared the thief, and ſeized his handkerchief, exclaiming—'You ſcoundrel, I have got your handkerchief, and you have mine: reſtore it to me this inſtant.' This was an example of ſearch for ſearch, but then each perſon acted from the conviction that the other had a handkerchief.

"The Engliſh and Americans were not on equal terms in the affair of the Cheſapeak, to which particular affair I do not allude for any other purpoſe than to ſhew, that a code founded upon perfect equality will not do in time of war. In time of peace it is quite practicable; but it will not do with reſpect to neutrals in time of war, becauſe the belligerent and the neutral are always under UNEQUAL CIRCUMSTANCES—*they never can be on an equality.*"

According to this doctrine, if a man picks my pocket, I

have no right to ſearch him unleſs I have picked his pocket too, becauſe we are not upon an equality; and by a parity of reaſoning, Britiſh ſhips of war are not to reclaim their ſeamen, becauſe, as they have received no deſerters from American ſhips, they are not upon an equality! Here Mr. Medford adopts the old proverb, ſet a thief to catch a thief, in its fulleſt extent; for if his argument holds good, no honeſt man ought to touch a thief, becauſe they are not upon an equality. He merits the thanks of the fraternity of pick-pockets, for this ingenious ſpecimen of logic.

We ſhall now extract his ſentiments on the rights of neutrals.

"Much has been ſaid to prove that a neutral has no right to derive gain or profit from the misfortune of a neighbouring ſtate engaged in war; but, in my humble opinion, this is the moſt ſhallow of all arguments. The evil of the one and advantages of the other, are circumſtances not connected by any right whatever. If I break my leg, and my neighbour next door who is a ſurgeon is paid for ſetting it, he gains by my misfortune. In like manner, when one man dies or fails in trade, another, or others, get his buſineſs. This is natural, nay, it is unavoidable; the buſineſs muſt be done, and juſtice or right have no connection with the buſineſs."

This is not a correct ſtatement of the caſe as it relates to Great Britain; ſhe has not loſt her buſineſs, but America wants to take it away from her. France indeed has loſt her buſineſs, and America claims the right of carrying that on too. If a neutral power is permitted to carry on the commerce of the enemy under her flag, and thus relieve him from the preſſure of our maritime ſuperiority, ſhe renders him the ſame aſſiſtance as Venus rendered to her diſabled hero, by veiling him in a cloud, and bearing him out of the reach of his victorious antagoniſt. But we truſt that Britain, like Diomed, will ſtill purſue the foe, even in the arms of the Goddeſs, and puniſh her partial interference.

The third chapter treats of the miſtatements of writers on the ſubject of the report of the Weſt India committee, and of thoſe who pretend to ſtate facts. Mr. Medford ſays, that amongſt thoſe who have been examined as to the ſhipping, in order to determine its increaſe or decreaſe, and thoſe who have been examined relative to the Weſt India trade, he finds nothing but exaggeration. We ſhall give his charges againſt them at full length.

"The Weſt India merchants make it appear that ſugar coſts more than it ſells for. Yes, that they do; and they are very accurate:—20*s* 10*d* per cwt. and 15*s* bringing over make the coſt. About 33*s*

the ſelling price. They have not informed us from what large and liberal purſe the money comes that ſupplies this deficiency. We ſee Weſt India merchants ſtill living like princes; but when they come before the Parliament they have got the whining cant of beggars.—There muſt be ſome myſtery in all this; neither the iron bridges, nor any of the wild beaſts at the Tower, are ſo curious and inexplicable as this ſimple fact, corroborated moſt ſolemnly by men of honour and fortune.

"In the north bears live under the ſnow by ſucking their paws; toads have lived for years ſhut up without light or food; and a tortoiſe has been known to hold a faſt of an unuſual length; but though natural philoſophers conſider ſuch phenomena as wonderful, the bears, toads, and tortoiſes, are nothing to the Weſt India merchants: the former exiſt on nothing, but they do not get fat. The Weſt India merchant lives on leſs than nothing, and gets very fat!!

"How can all this be? The thing is not credible. It is not poſſible. There muſt be a cauſe. Now without poſitively aſſerting what the cauſe is, I think I have a ſhrewd gueſs.

"Amongſt the chief expences of the 20*s* 10*d* prime coſt of ſugars, are loſs upon bills of exchange drawn on England, enormouſly high prices paid for every thing ſupplied by the Britiſh merchant, and the intereſt of all the money advanced. If thoſe items were taken off, the ſugar would not coſt near ſo much as it appears to do now.

"Again, as to the ſecond ſum of 15*s*, a great part of that conſiſts in commiſſion, profit, brokerage, and expence of ſelling; ſo that, on the whole, the ſugar that appears to coſt 36*s* did not coſt in reality above 26*s*; and the Weſt India merchant, who ſeems to get fat upon a loſs of 3*s* per cwt., is in reality getting fat on a profit of 6 or 7*s* per cwt.

"This calculation may not be very accurate: but the matter certainly is only to be explained in that way; and it is fit that it ſhould be known, for at preſent the public is deceived.

"The ſugars are repreſented as lying on hand, to the ruin and deſtruction of the merchants; yet, in the Weſt India Docks there were* but 31,000 hogſheads, which, at 35*s* each [cwt.], makes only the ſum of 675,000*l*; a ſum not equal to the fortunes of ſome ſingle individuals concerned in the trade; and not more than uſed to be advanced in better times before the bonding ſyſtem was adopted. To be able to comprehend the whole of the exaggerations in the examination of the different gentlemen concerned in the Weſt India trade, in the Appendix will be found ſome ſpecimens of it; but it is not only neceſſary to give a ſpecimen, but to make ſome obſervations."

Though the Weſt India merchants have not informed us from what large and liberal purſe the money comes that ſupplies the deficiency of the planters, Mr. Medford has;

"* At the time the report of the Weſt India committee was made."

for he ſtates 675,000*l* to be a ſum not equal to the fortune of ſome ſingle individuals concerned in that trade. Here then the reſource is pointed out, and he has himſelf explained what he terms an inexplicable myſtery, without knowing it. It is unqueſtionably true, that if from the 20*s* 10*d* prime coſt of ſugar the enormous high prices paid for every thing ſupplied by the Britiſh merchant, and the intereſt of the money advanced, were deducted, the ſugar would not coſt near ſo much as it now appears to do; but unfortunately ſugar cannot be manufactured without a conſtant ſupply of various articles; nor can eſtates be either ſettled or purchaſed without capital; and in theſe days there is no buying without money and without price, nor will thoſe who have capital lend it without intereſt. On referring to the charges on the ſale of ſugar in the Appendix to this work, we preſume that Government will not relinquiſh the duty, nor the ſhip owner the freight, nor the Weſt India Dock Company their dues, nor the underwriter his premium, nor the broker his brokerage; we therefore cannot diſcover how the merchant, whoſe commiſſion of $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent for effecting inſurance is 1*l*, and of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on the ſale is 9*l* 15*s*, making together 10*l* 15*s* on 130 cwt. of ſugar, or ſomething under 1*s* 8*d* per cwt., can juſtly be repreſented as getting very fat on a profit of 6 or 7*s* per cwt. Mr. Medford's calculation, as he obſerves, is not very accurate; though where a writer profeſſes to correct miſtatements in others, accuracy in his own ſtatements might be expected; and as he alſo obſerves, "it is fit that it ſhould be known, for at preſent the public is deceived;" that is, if the public gives any credit to his repreſentations.

It is true that the report of the Weſt India committee ſtates, that on the 15th of July laſt there were only 31,000 hogſheads of ſugar in the Weſt India Dock warehouſes; for the merchants had availed themſelves of the opening afforded them in the ſpring by the connivance of King Lewis at the intercourſe between this country and Holland, to make immenſe ſhipments to that market. But it is equally true, that a few months before, when the merchants complained of the quantity of ſugar on hand, Lord Temple, after due inveſtigation, confirmed the fact, by declaring in Parliament that it amounted to 160,000 hhds.; and it is alſo true, that, ſince the arrival of the preſent crop, the quantity has again accumulated, ſo that not leſs than 100,000 hhds. are at this time on hand, in the port of London alone; while the ſeverity with which Buonaparte's decree, excluding Britiſh manufactures, and colonial produce, is now enforced, has cut off the reſource before reſorted to.

The veracity of one of the gentlemen who gave evidence before the committee is ſtrongly impeached.

" It is very evident, from the preciſe nature of the anſwers given, that the minds of the informants had been made up, and that, too, with a moſt aſtoniſhing degree of accuracy. 20*s* 10*d*, ſays Mr. Andrew Wedderburn, is the firſt coſt of 1 cwt. of ſugar in Jamaica. Indeed! If the Preſident of the Board of Agriculture had been aſked if he, amongſt the hundreds of volumes written on that ſubject, had pretended to calculate the firſt coſt of a buſhel of wheat, would he have pretended to ſtate it to a penny? No: he would have ſaid, in no particular caſe could it be accurately aſcertained, though it may within about 2*s* or 3*s* a buſhel, but then that would be to little purpoſe, for time and place make perpetual differences. That is to ſay, the caſe is different in two contiguous fields, and in the ſame field in two different years; and even when the crops are got in and finiſhed, we cannot be accurate in one ſingle inſtance.

" Perhaps it may be ſaid, this is true; but then the ſugar crops in Jamaica are more certain, the mode more regular, and the ſurveyors better calculators than Engliſh farmers or gentlemen. This, however, is not quite the caſe.

" The ſugar crops are the moſt uncertain poſſible: Jamaica property is proverbially hazardous. In England the produce of land may be uncertain, yet the chief expence of raiſing corn is quite certain. The rent of land is fixed, the wages of labour (I mean in any one inſtance), and the expence of keeping horſes and maintaining ſervants, may be very nearly eſtimated; yet, with all this, the farmer can make no very accurate eſtimate.

" In Jamaica every expence is uncertain: the price of proviſions and of every ſort of ſtock, the weather and the produce; yet the reſult was given with accuracy.

" Again, would it not have been natural and neceſſary to know how the loſing buſineſs was carried on; to know of what items this accurate calculation conſiſted; and to add other queſtions that might have ariſen from thoſe anſwers? Then perhaps the true ſtate of things might have been known. As it is, I do maintain that we are miſled, and that 20*s* 10*d* is not the coſt price, but is a ſort of average taken, at which planters could afford to ſell for ready money on the ſpot, with a reaſonable profit, after having paid exorbitant prices for ſlaves, as well as of all ſorts of materials imported from Europe."

We are perſuaded that Mr. Medford muſt have taken his account of the report in queſtion from hearſay; for if he had read it, he could not but have known of what items this accurate calculation conſiſted, as the particulars are ſtated at length, and occupy no leſs than ten folio pages. The eſtimate is formed from the accounts of eight different eſtates in Jamaica, for the years 1803, 1804, 1805, and 1806. The charges on theſe eſtates vary according to their natural ad-

vantages, and to other circumſtances, leaving 20*s* 10*d* as the average coſt of one cwt. of ſugar, excluſive of the rum, and without any allowance whatever being made either for intereſt of capital, or the purchaſe of negroes. Having on one ſide ſpecific ſtatements, corroborated moſt ſolemnly (to uſe Mr. Medford's own words) by men of honour and fortune; and, on the other ſide, his bare aſſertion, unſupported by any ſtatement or proof whatever, we can be at no loſs to decide to which we ought to give credit. Before we quit the ſubject of miſtatements, we ſhall notice an attack on the Britiſh ſhip-owners, in the appendix to this work. Mr. Medford ſays,

"In an appendix to a pamphlet, called Conceſſions to America, on the ſubject of Britiſh ſhipping, I find it ſtated that, 'Since the year 1780, the rate of freights has decreaſed 6*l* 10*s* 4*d* per cent, although, ſince the ſame period, the price of proviſions has increaſed 84*l* 8*s* 2*d* per cent, the price of materials 122*l* 10*s* 2*d* per cent, and rate of wages 39*l* 7*s* 1*d* per cent. No wonder, then, that brooms were at the maſt-heads, as tokens of there being for ſale, of near 18,000 tons of ſhipping in the river Thames alone laſt year.'"

And ridicules the idea of this "moſt ACCURATE pamphleteer" pretending to give a *true* ſtatement, in the following terms:

"I cannot help taking notice of the 2*d* per cent, that is to ſay, a twelve-thouſandth part of the whole in the price of proviſions!!!! This is really being extremely accurate; but how does any man come to ſpeak ſo exactly without ſtating what the proviſions are?—A quarter of a farthing on the ſack of flour would make ten times this difference, or two-pence on a ton of butter; and I believe no dealer can calculate to ſuch a nicety.

"When this writer ſtates that there were 18,000 tons of ſhipping in the river Thames laſt year, for ſale, he conceals the tonnage of Engliſh ſhipping, amounting, in all, to 2,271,928 tons, of which 18,000 tons is the 126th part; neither does he ſay how many ſhips. If they were as large as the Iſis, of Alexandria, is deſcribed to have been, it would only require four ſhips and a half to make the ſame tonnage."

The pamphlet in queſtion gives the authority from which theſe ſtatements are taken; the Report and Papers on Navigation and Trade, printed by order of the Society of Ship-Owners of Great Britain in 1807, and refers to the pages from whence they are extracted. Had Mr. Medford availed himſelf of this reference, he would have found comparative ſtatements of the rate of freight, the rate of ſeamen's wages, and the price of every article of ſhip's materials and proviſions, in the years 1780 and 1805; on which ſtatements the

calculations alluded to are founded. In the ſame book he might alſo have found, and have examined, the accounts of a number of Weſt India ſhips, belonging to houſes of the firſt reſpectability; which ſhew, that notwithſtanding the high freight paid on ſugar, they are in general loſing concerns. In the ſame book, too, he might have ſatisfied himſelf of the name and deſcription of every ſhip advertiſed for ſale in the river Thames, in the year 1806. When plain ſtatements are ſubmitted to public inveſtigation and ſcrutiny, and ſtand unimpeached, their validity will not be ſhaken either by the *perſiflage*, or incredulity, of Mr. Medford.

The leading object of the next chapter, which treats of the Weſt India trade, appears to be to ſhew the advantages derived by the manufacturing intereſts of Great Britain from the extenſive commerce now carried on between America and the French and Spaniſh colonies. We ſhall not wander into the wide fields of conjecture with Mr. Medford, in attempting to aſcertain whether his ſuppoſitions on this ſubject are well founded or not; but even admitting them ſo to be, we contend that theſe advantages are more than counterbalanced by the ſources of wealth and revenue thus opened to the enemy, and the diſtreſs occaſioned to our own Weſt India colonies by that ruinous competition in the European market to which it expoſes them. Of this he has furniſhed full proof, by quoting a document handed to the Weſt India committee, which ſhews, that through this traffic the foreign planter has his ſugar conveyed to the continental markets of Europe at a lower rate of freight than the Britiſh planter, by 6*s* 6*d* per cwt.; and his inſurance is of courſe cheaper in an equal proportion. As Mr. Medford juſtly obſerves, "while this is ſo, the Britiſh Weſt India planters muſt grow poor, and the Americans grow rich:" (he might have added the foreign planters too:) and this proves the neceſſity of adopting a different ſyſtem. Of whom then has the Britiſh planter to complain? Not of the Britiſh merchant, for he ſupports him in his diſtreſs to the extent of his means; not of the Britiſh ſhip-owner, for the high freight which he receives is ſtill inadequate to indemnify him for the expence at which his veſſels are equipped and navigated; but of the American merchant and American ſhip-owner, who enable his rivals to underſell him, and prevent him from enjoying that monopoly of the European market, which, in former wars, gave him a compenſation for the increaſed charges to which he was ſubjected. We have then the detail of a ſuppoſititious commercial tranſaction between a merchant in London and a merchant in America, the object of which we preſume is, to reproach the

Britiſh underwriters for not violating the laws of their country, by inſuring againſt Britiſh capture. Bitter complaints are made of the neceſſity impoſed upon American veſſels of diſcharging their Weſt India cargoes in one of their own ports before they proceed to Europe, ſo as to break the continuity of the voyage. This, Mr. Medford ſays, is ſo ridiculous, that he will explain it; on which explanation we have to remark, that if the Americans were permitted to go direct to Europe they would convey the produce of the foreign planter there at ſtill lower rates of freight and inſurance than they now do; and he would acquire a ſtill greater advantage over the Britiſh planter than he now poſſeſſes. The ridiculous conduct of Great Britain is in conceding what ſhe has already done, not in refuſing to concede more. The hardſhip of this reſtriction on the American Weſt India trade is contraſted with the facility with which, according to Mr. Medford, licences may be obtained, by paying about twenty guineas fees of office for any voyage, however unaccountable; to enumerate the whole of which he declares would fill more pages than he intends his pamphlet to contain. One of them, which he gives in the form of a caſe, we ſhall extract.

"CASE.—Great Britain and Spain are at war; America is at war with Spain, but at peace with England. One of the American ſhips of war being off Vera Cruz, learns that there is an Engliſh frigate at Vera Cruz receiving thouſands and thouſands of dollars on board from the royal mint. The American conceiving ſhe muſt be a Spaniſh frigate in diſguiſe, waits for her coming out, and captures her, and finds one millions of pounds on board. The captain of the Engliſh frigate proteſts that ſhe is an Engliſh frigate; and ſhews an order from the Lords of the Admiralty, ordering her to go there for the dollars: the whole appearing ſo unaccountable, the American captain agrees to bring the frigate to England, and let it be decided by the Admiralty court. When the cauſe comes on, the following facts appear.

"An Engliſh broker comes forward and claims it as his; but not being able to prove any connection with the royal mint of Vera Cruz, or how he got the king of Spain's order, or a royal licence for a Britiſh frigate, further proof is ordered; when a Hamburgh broker comes forward, but he alſo not being able to explain the tranſaction, or how he got the property, more proof is ſtill requeſted.

"After that Monſieur Talleyrand comes forward and puts in a claim, but his claim being ſtill worſe, further proof is again ordered; when the Prince of Peace comes forward and explains the whole tranſaction. The king of Spain it ſeems wanting money to pay to France, Talleyrand had appeared to purchaſe dollars from him in the royal mint, in Vera Cruz; he had ſold them to Monſieur Talley-

rand at two ſhillings and ſixpence, and Talleyrand had paid the Hamburgh broker one per cent, and the London broker one per cent. Such was the tranſaction; but whether the Britiſh miniſters received alſo a per centage for the uſe of the Engliſh frigate, or not, he never could get Talleyrand to explain.

"*Queſtion*—Would the dollars be a good prize? and in what authors, upon the laws of nations, is ſuch tranſaction juſtified?

"Was the Reſiſtance Engliſh frigate laſt year not ordered to Vera Cruz, and did ſhe not arrive at Portſmouth on the 26th of February, 1807, with eight hundred thouſand pounds in dollars? That ſuch voyages take place, ſee the following extract from the Morning Poſt.

"London, Feb. 28, 1807.

"The Reſiſtance frigate, Captain Adam, from the Weſt Indies, is arrived at Portſmouth, having on board upwards of four millions of dollars, which ſhe brought from Vera Cruz, by permiſſion of the Britiſh and Spaniſh governments · the Reſiſtance ſailed from Vera Cruz on the 14th of January."

Another article, which appeared in moſt of the daily papers in the month of September laſt, will further illuſtrate this ſubject.

"The Britiſh frigate, Diana, Captain Malling, arrived at Jamaica the end of July, and proceeded for Vera Cruz, having on board the ſon of Sir Francis Baring. The Mediator, with a million of dollars on board, alſo arrived about the ſame time from Vera Cruz."

We believe it to be found policy in the Britiſh government to grant licences for neutral ſhips to take Britiſh manufactured goods out to the Spaniſh colonies, and bring back ſpecie or produce in return; but that licences ſhould be granted to perſons to bring ſpecie home, who ſend no goods out, that ſpecie too part of the ſubſidy due from Spain to France, and that his Majeſty's ſhips of war ſhould be employed thus to protect the property of the enemy, inſtead of being employed to capture it, appears to us inexplicable. We know not upon what principle his Majeſty's late miniſters can juſtify ſuch a tranſaction, and we truſt it will be made the ſubject of parliamentary inveſtigation.

The laſt chapter of this work diſcuſſes "the advantages and diſadvantages of a war between America and England, to each country." It is denied that the confiſcation of Britiſh debts would be any advantage to America; but aſſerted that, on the contrary, if a balance were drawn, more property would be found in England belonging to America, than in America belonging to England. We much doubt, whether Mr. Medford is correct in this idea; but not chooſing to invade his province of imaginary calculations and ſuppoſitions,

we ſhall paſs on to the advantages which he ſays America would derive from a war with Great Britain, and which he enumerates under the following heads:

Conqueſt of Canada;
Privateers;
The free trade of the Engliſh Weſt Indies;
Preventing the Engliſh fiſhing on the bank of Newfoundland.

With regard to the former project, Mr. Medford ſays, "my mind is made up, that America can take Canada whenever ſhe pleaſes. I do not like to ſpeak poſitively without having ſolid grounds. In conſequence, I applied to a gentleman on whom I could depend, who has perfectly ſatisfied my mind." Not having had the advantage of being enlightened by this gentleman, we confeſs that our minds are not ſo ſatisfied. America made the attempt in the former war, but her forces were repulſed; her commanding officer, General Montgomery, was killed, and the enterpriſe miſcarried. We cannot think that ſhe would ſucceed now where ſhe failed before; for ſhe has ſcarcely any regular troops; and her militia, although very uſeful as a defenſive force, can no more be expected to undertake an offenſive war in a foreign country, than the volunteers of Great Britain. Mr. Medford eſtimates, in his own way, the extreme injury that the commerce of Great Britain would ſuſtain from the American privateers; and makes the following calculation. "Laſt war the Engliſh captured from the Americans 904 ſhips; the Americans captured from the Engliſh 733 ſhips. The number of American privateers was 173. As Great Britain had at that time 6,200 ſhips, and ſhe has at preſent 21,725 ſhips; ſuppoſing the American privateers to have only increaſed in the ſame proportion as the Engliſh ſhips have done (but I calculate they would a vaſt deal more in the ſame time), the loſs of Britiſh ſhips would be 2,500 ſhips." The queſtion would perhaps have been more correctly ſtated thus: if America captured 733 ſail of Britiſh ſhips laſt war, when Britain was contending for the ſovereignty of the ocean, and unable to afford adequate protection to her commerce, how many ſhips would America capture now, that Britain has eſtabliſhed the ſovereignty of the ocean, and is able to afford full protection to her commerce? Mr. Medford entertains very extraordinary ſentiments reſpecting the Weſt Indies.

"What the courſe is which America muſt purſue with reſpect to the Weſt Indies will require the utmoſt conſideration to determine; for I conſider her more intereſted in the welfare of them than

Great Britain: before long they muſt, in the courſe of things, belong to America, and England will be much richer without them.

"If a war ſhould not take place, if Great Britain was at once to give up all the iſlands and ſettlements to America, and pay the Engliſh merchants what they have advanced, ſhe would be a much richer nation than ſhe is at preſent; for I conceive that in the place of about 14,000,000*l*, which America and the Weſt Indies now take of her manufactures, they would take 20,000,000*l*, and in the courſe of ten years 30,000,000*l*. In the courſe of twenty years more Great Britain could not manufacture enough."

According to this Utopian project, Great Britain ſhould pay nearly one hundred millions to the Weſt India proprietors, that ſhe may give up thoſe colonies to America; and then they are immediately to take off manufactures to the amount of twenty millions per annum; in the courſe of ten years to the amount of thirty millions; and, in the courſe of twenty years, to a greater amount that ſhe could furniſh manufactures. He ſhould have told us how the Weſt Indies are to pay for all theſe manufactures. Unleſs they raiſed much more produce than they now do, they could not pay for them; and if they did raiſe more, the growth would exceed the conſumption of Europe, and the ſurplus would conſequently find no purchaſers. Mr. Medford ſees little to prevent America from taking Jamaica. He overlooks, then, the Britiſh navy, as he ſeems to do when he talks of preventing us from fiſhing on the bank of Newfoundland. But America can ſtarve the iſlands, or oblige them to declare themſelves independent of Great Britain. He forgets, then, that the time has been when the iſlands continued in a ſtate of hoſtility with America for many years, without either being ſtarved, or declaring themſelves independent. They would, in fact, ſuffer leſs from her hoſtility than they now ſuffer from her neutrality.

Next follows the detail of the diſadvantages to Great Britain.

"Dangers of ſtarving the Weſt India iſlands.
of loſing the Weſt India iſlands.
of loſing Canada.
of ſuffering by privateers.
of ſuffering by want of corn.
of ſuffering by want of cotton.
of the loſs to Britiſh manufacturers."

The dangers of ſtarving or loſing the Weſt India iſlands, of loſing Canada, and ſuffering by privateers, have been already noticed. In adverting to the danger of ſuffering by want of

corn, Mr. Medford quotes the year 1801, in which Great Britain and her colonies imported 1,816,582 quarters. But as every evil has a tendency to check itſelf, ſo the quantity of land which has been encloſed and cultivated, in conſequence of that year of ſcarcity, has made the country ſo independent of importation, that no advance has taken place in the price of corn, although our accuſtomed imports have almoſt entirely ceaſed, in conſequence of the countries from whence they were drawn having fallen under the dominion of France. The ſupply of the Weſt Indies with corn would be attended with no inconvenience to Great Britain, as the quantity now uſed in the diſtilleries, which might be ſaved by the ſubſtitution of ſugar, would fully ſuffice for their conſumption. We are threatened with the want of cotton for our manufactures, as one of the evils reſulting from an American war; and yet we are told, that "not ſeventeen years ago, Lord Grenville and Mr. Jay were engaged in making a treaty, in which it was ſtipulated by Lord Grenville, that no cotton ſhould be imported from America." Had Mr. Medford given the ſubject a little conſideration, this ſeeming paradox would have been explained, and he would have been ſatisfied that Lord Grenville's ſtipulation was highly judicious; for the importation of cotton from America has ruined the cultivation of it in the Britiſh Weſt India colonies, and obliged moſt of the cotton planters there to turn their eſtates into canes, by which means the quantity of ſugar has been increaſed beyond the demand. The cultivation of cotton can be reſumed in a ſingle year. England, therefore, would be at no loſs for a ſupply; and the ruin would fall, not on the Britiſh manufacturers, but on the American cotton planters.

We now come to the author's general deductions, obſervations, and propoſals, in conſequence of the foregoing enquiry. He concludes, that Great Britain and America would both ſuffer in the conteſt, and that "if Great Britain urges on the war, ſhe does ſo becauſe it is her intereſt, or that ſhe conceives it to be ſo." He, however, decides that the diſadvantages on her ſide would greatly preponderate. Looking into the remote conſequences of the war, he ſays,

"Should Britain ſink in the conteſt ſhe now maintains with European powers, let it not be thought that that would be a matter of triumph for America; no, the world would be again plunged in deſpotiſm, and darkneſs would ſoon follow. The age of commerce would be over, for deſpots do not admit of its flouriſhing under their hands. Would this be any advantage to America, even if ſhe could ſtand aloof from the danger? Certainly not. But again, could Ame-

rica ſtand aloof? No. Although extenſive, and probably about to become one of the moſt powerful nations on earth, ſhe is not yet able to cope with the Coloſſus of Europe. Diviſions will be excited in her councils; the Eaſt will be divided from the Weſt; and America will remain long under the hard and diſtreſſing influence of that power which aims not at freedom; which aims not at the conqueſt of ſingle kingdoms; which aims not at the conqueſt of Europe, but of the whole world!!"

It is ſtrange that he ſhould prophecy ſuch evils to America from the hoſtility of France alone, when America is inacceſſible to her armies, but is aſſailable by the fleets of Great Britain. May not diviſions be excited in her councils, and the Eaſt be divided from the Weſt, in conſequence of a war with the latter, as well as with the former? He then reverts to the old outcry againſt intereſted merchants, ſays the caſe is as he has ſtated it to be; condemns the data from which perſons are led to judge, ſuch as examinations of Weſt India merchants, determinations in prize cauſes, and pamphlets publiſhed; and concludes with obſerving, that "as the great portion of readers have not an opportunity to review evidence againſt evidence, and ſet off argument againſt argument, he has done this for them; hoping that two nations that muſt loſe ſo much by war, and gain ſo much by peace, will not be raſhly led to the ruinous expedient of force, by the falſe or intereſted repreſentations of individuals."

In reviewing Mr. Medford's "Obſervations on European Courts," in our laſt number, we had occaſion to call in queſtion both his impartiality and information on commercial ſubjects. In this opinion of him we are fully confirmed by the examination of the pamphlet now before us; and extend it to his impartiality on political ſubjects alſo, where America is concerned. His preſent production is very inferior to his former in point of compoſition; and appears to have been haſtily written on the reigning topics of the day, rather with the view of attracting popular attention than of adding to the reputation of the author. The writer who undertakes the diſcuſſion of ſubjects at once complicated and important, ſhould bring to the taſk a ſound natural judgment, and conſiderable acquired knowledge. That Mr. Medford does not poſſeſs theſe qualifications in an eminent degree is not his fault; but it is his fault that he has publiſhed his ſentiments on topics without obtaining that information reſpecting them, the means of which lay open to him. It is his fault, that he makes aſſertions falſe in themſelves, and injurious to the reputation of others, becauſe it was his duty to aſcertain their truth. It is his fault, that he uſes abuſe inſtead of argument,

and ſubſtitutes contradiction for confutation; and that Mr. Medford has all theſe faults to anſwer for, we have abundantly ſhewn. Either from inadvertency or ſelf-ſufficiency he has ſuffered it to eſcape him, that "for years paſt he has ſhipped to America goods, the manufactures of Great Britain, to the amount of 100,000*l*." Thus it appears, that this gentleman, who rails inceſſantly at intereſted men, is as much intereſted himſelf in the extenſion of the commerce of America as any Britiſh Weſt India merchant or ſhip-owner can poſſibly be in confining it within its fair and wonted limits. Here we have the clue to his poſition, "that Great Britain muſt ſubmit to the advantages which America may gain by her being engaged in a war with the other European powers;" and to the acrimony with which he treats all thoſe who maintain a contrary opinion. As Demetrius, the ſilverſmith, who made ſilver ſhrines for Diana, the goddeſs of Epheſus, oppoſed the preaching of Paul, and ſet up the cry of, Great is Diana of the Epheſians; ſo Mr. Medford, influenced by the ſame conſideration (for by this craft we have our wealth), oppoſes thoſe who preach the ſound doctrine of the rights of Britain, and ſets up the cry of, Great is Columbia. He probably well knows, that many articles which are not adapted for home conſumption may anſwer for exportation. His book appears to us to be of that deſcription. Though it will not well bear the ſcrutiny of Britiſh critics, being *minus aptus acutis naribus horum hominum*; yet, happily, in America there are no reviewers, and the general tenour of the ſentiments may give it popularity with a certain claſs of readers, who, if their political animoſities againſt this country are gratified, require of an author neither elegance of compoſition, nor accuracy of ſtatement. We would therefore adviſe Mr. Medford to pack up all the copies of this pamphlet which remain unſold, either at his printer's, or at Meſſrs. Richardſons, Cornhill; and conſign them to his friend Mr. Thomas Dobſon, Philadelphia.

The Epics of the Ton; or, the Glories of the Great World.

[Concluded from vol. xxvii, p. 417.]

IN our preceding Review, we limited our obſervations to the firſt part of this production, to that which the author calls *the Female Book*. Our attention is now to be directed to *the Male Book*. So long as we found him the ſteady advocate of morals, laſhing the follies and vices of faſhionable life,

and endeavouring to ſtem that torrent of immorality which threatens, more than the ſwords of our enemies, to bring deſolation and ruin on the land, we overlooked trivial blemiſhes, and gave him that honeſt and cordial approbation, to which the excellence of his plan and the ability of the execution ſo juſtly entitled him. But our diſappointment was great in peruſing the ſecond part, or *Male Book*, which is greatly inferior, in the diſplay of talents, to the firſt, and in which cenſure and even abuſe are laviſhed without diſcrimination, and, in many inſtances, without juſtice. The author, indeed, ſeems to have adopted one of the moſt erroneous notions which ever entered the head of man; namely, that the beſtowal of praiſe is a certain proof of ſervility or corruption; and that the infliction of cenſure is the only infallible mark of independence. Let him but ſilently trace this notion to its ſource, and then purſue it to its conſequences, and he will, or we miſtake him much, haſten to retract it. In many parts, too, the irony is ſo very finely ſpun as almoſt to loſe its character and property; and, in ſome caſes, it is impoſſible to underſtand what the author really means. It muſt, not, however, be inferred, from theſe obſervations, that *every* page of the ſecond part of this poem is either devoted to cenſure, or deſerving of it; ſuch an inference would be alike unwarrantable and unjuſt.

The firſt character here exhibited is the Duke of Portland, but, if the reader can collect, from the bard's delineation, any one feature of it, he muſt have more penetration than we can lay claim to. Mere common-place abuſe, without any attempt even at diſcrimination, pervades the whole portrait. The ſecond, is Lord Henry Petty, who is thus uſhered in to public notice.

" When mighty foes, now mightier than before,
Turn all their wrath on our deſerted ſhore;
When many a king dethron'd, and plunder'd ſtate
Would ſeem to warn us of approaching fate;
Whom ſhould we ſeek to ſnatch the wav'ring helm,
And through the ſhoals conduct the plungin realm?
The man who oft, mid tempeſts loud and
Has ſeen the breakers daſh around the bar
Who proudly reſolute, and ſternly brave,
Seems to require no ſecond hand to ſave;
Plans for himſelf, and what he plans perfecting
As deaf to prayers as to the raging ſtorm is fault
Who ſtout in words, nor leſs in count'nance bold,
Confirms the timid, animates the cold;
And ſeems prepar'd, when all at length is loſt,
Still to ſtand up, and periſh on his poſt:

Such is the man for this dark ſeaſon fit ;
Such once we had, for ſuch a man was PITT.

" Peace to his ſhade ! Be all his faults forgot !
Complete perfection is no human lot.
He was a ſtateſman from his cradle bred,
And high and lofty tower'd his youthful head ;
His idol glory, matchleſs power his pride,
All meaner ends were thrown with ſcorn aſide ;
While wealth and honours on his nod *await*,
He liv'd a commoner, and died in *debt* ;—
A debt his grateful country pays in tears,
And counts it little of her vaſt arrears."

A long note is ſubjoined to theſe lines, which opens with a maxim, to the juſtice of which we cordially *ſubſcribe*, and which we ſhall preſently take occaſion to *apply*. It is " the taſk of the critic to ſpeak impartial truth." Then follows a long character of Mr. Pitt, in proſe, which the author modeſtly inſinuates to be the only juſt character ever drawn of that ſtateſman. " Receive," he ſays, " the true Mr. Pitt at my hands, and let me indulge the fond hope that poſterity, diſguſted with the ſturdy declamations of Belſham, the ill-aſſorted newſpapers of Biſſet, the lick-duſt encomiums of Adolphus, or Gifford, and M'Arthur's promiſed waggon-load of Gazettes ſoaked in train-oil, may ſeek for fair truth in the annotations of an Epic !" This is certainly an eaſy way to *fix* the characters of public writers, but not ſuch a way as truth would purſue. The epithet *lick-duſt*, applied to the writings of Mr. Adolphus and Mr. Gifford, is *equally* worthy of admiration for its *correctneſs* and for its *eloquence :* the author alludes, we ſuppoſe, to Mr. William Gifford, the tranſlator of Juvenal, whoſe name is mentioned in ſubſequent notes, on which we ſhall have ſome comments to offer.

We ſhall not enter into an analyſis of the character of Mr. Pitt, which is certainly drawn with ability, though many objections might be ſtarted to its accuracy ; particularly to the remarks on the *preference* ſaid to have been given by Mr. Pitt to war over peace, after the murder of the King of France ; and to thoſe, on the viſionary apprehenſions of the great majority of the nation, at the period of the Loyal Aſſociations. We ſhall briefly obſerve that the war was a war of *neceſſity*, not a war of *choice ;* and that the dangers which threatened the country, from the machinations of the diſaffected, were not *viſionary* but *real*. His character of Mr. Pitt's oratorical talents, though extremely laboured, is not perfectly juſt ; and we are almoſt led to conclude, by one part of it, that he never heard Mr. Pitt ſpeak. When he imputes

to his ſpeeches triteneſs of idea, and want of correſpondence between the different members of his ſentences, he aſcribes to them qualities, for the abſence of which Mr. Pitt's orations were peculiarly diſtinguiſhed. So far was this from being the caſe, and ſuch, on the contrary, was the claſſical accuracy of his ſpeeches, that it would have puzzled a much more correct writer than this annotator to improve a ſingle ſentence by any alteration which would not have deſtroyed the ſenſe. If, indeed, he has formed his opinion of Mr. Pitt's oratory from the ſpecimens exhibited in the various reports of his ſpeeches, his inaccuracy may be very naturally accounted for.

But it is not on account of ſuch falſe eſtimates of character that we are diſpoſed to cenſure our critic; but for his violation of his own maxim, that it is his duty "to ſpeak impartial truth." Unqueſtionably, when he took upon himſelf to condemn others, with ſo much deciſion, it behoved him to be particularly careful not to miſrepreſent facts himſelf. This, however, he has done. For inſtance, he charges Mr. Pitt with having deprived Sir John Sinclair of the Preſidency of the Board of Agriculture for having oppoſed him as a Miniſter. The fact is, that Sir John was *not* deprived of that poſt by Mr. Pitt; nor did Mr. Pitt think the Baronet's impotent oppoſition worthy the ſmalleſt diſplay of reſentment. Again, he reproaches Mr. Pitt with "boyiſh obſtinacy and pitiful revenge," qualities wholly foreign from his diſpoſition; and as inſtances of the prevalence of theſe qualities in his mind, he cites "his conduct to the unfortunate hawkers," an alluſion which we do not underſtand, "and his expulſion of his old antagoniſt Horne Tooke, under the unjuſtifiable and ridiculous pretext, that a man once in orders can never become a member of the Houſe of Commons." Here the author betrays either the moſt wilful miſrepreſentation, or the moſt unpardonable ignorance; for, in the firſt place, whoever has read Mr. Horne Tooke's "Two Pair of Portraits," muſt know that he was not the antagoniſt but the panegyriſt of Mr. Pitt; and the ſmalleſt inveſtigation of facts would have ſufficed to convince the author, firſt, that Mr. Horne Tooke was not expelled from the Houſe of Commons; and, ſecondly, that Mr. Pitt had nothing to do with the act which *declared* the incapacity of clergymen to hold ſeats in the Houſe of Commons. That act was brought in during Mr. Addington's adminiſtration, and by that miniſter himſelf; and ſo far from expelling Mr. Tooke, by an unnatural *luſt of conciliation* which marked all his meaſures, though the act was, of neceſſity, general in its operation, a clauſe was introduced into it,

for the ſpecific purpoſe of enabling Mr. Tooke to keep his ſeat!—Again, the author aſſerts, "He carried through his favourite meaſure, the Union with Ireland, by *promiſing Catholic Emancipation.*" It required no common aſſurance to make this aſſertion after the moſt poſitive denial of the fact, in the Houſe of Commons, by Mr. Pitt himſelf; who certainly never made any ſuch promiſe. The author proceeds, in this ſtrain of miſrepreſentation—"Untaught by his father's ſorrows," (what theſe were we are yet to learn) "he quarrelled with his moſt reſpectable friends, and threw himſelf defenceleſs into the arms of the court. Bereft of his independence, forſaken by the confidence of the nation, unſupported by the miſerable dependents with whom he had ſurrounded himſelf, and unfortunate in all his deareſt enterprizes, the agitations of his proud ſpirit overpowered the feebleneſs of an exhauſted body; and he fell, at an early age, amidſt the pangs of diſappointed ambition."—If there were nothing more than empty declamation in this ſentence, we ſhould deem it unworthy of notice, but it contains almoſt as many falſehoods as aſſertions. Mr. Pitt did *not* quarrel with his friends, but ſeveral of thoſe friends baſely forſook him, from the moſt ſelfiſh and deſpicable motives; he did *not* throw himſelf into the arms of the court, but merely obeyed the commands of his Sovereign (as it is the bounden duty of every ſubject to do) in taking upon him the office of Prime Miniſter; he was *not* bereft of his independence, but rigidly preſerved it to the laſt; he was *not* unſupported by any of his dependents whoſe ſupport could be of any uſe to him; he was *not* unfortunate in *all* his deareſt enterprizes, ſince "he carried through his *favourite* meaſure, the Union with Ireland;" ſince he made the French evacuate Egypt; and ſince he preſerved his country from the horrors of a revolution, and kept her Conſtitution entire; and he did not fall, as is here inſinuated, a prey to diſappointed ambition; for though he was foiled in his meritorious efforts for reſcuing the continent of Europe from the mercileſs fangs of an unprincipled uſurper, his own ambition was *not* diſappointed, but fully gratified by the attainment of the higheſt honour to which he ever aſpired. Laſtly, we are informed, "his public declarations in favour of religion were ardent, but his private convictions were never found, and his expiring moments were not thoſe of confidence:"—No, nor were thoſe of Dr. Johnſon; but will any one preſume to infer that the Doctor was therefore not a ſound Chriſtian? As to the bold aſſertion reſpecting Mr. Pitt's private convictions, we are confident that the author is profoundly ignorant of the fact, and that he has not the leaſt

foundation for what he advances. Our readers will now decide whether the author has fulfilled the critic's taſk, "to ſpeak impartial truth;" or whether he has ſuffered his paſſions and his prejudices to influence his judgment, and to guide his pen? We now return from the notes to the text, where the author, in ſtating what Mr. Pitt *was not*, ſhews what his ſucceſſor *was*.

"When Europe ſunk, and Britain ſtood aghaſt,
And Freedom trembled at the ſweeping blaſt;
Thou ne'er wer't known, with dangling, petty grace,
At Lady Bab's to ſhew thy ſimp'ring face;
At routs to flutter, or at hops to trip,
A bow to ſtudy, criticize a dip,
Conſult with Hoby on the neweſt boot,
And hear Floriche upon a birth-day ſuit;
Thy trappings more than taxes to debate,
And more thy motions ſtudy than the ſtate;
Or ſtill at H—ll—d Houſe to ſmirk and dine,
And charm my lady by your looks ſo fine;
Accept her box to ſnuff the country air,
And waſte your many hours of leiſure there*;
Politely pliant or to dine or dance,
And but in council give a thought to France:
Or, in the ſenate, quite as brilliant grown,
And quite as pliant, ſwell, in gentle tone,
The ſmooth round ſpeech, whoſe lubricating phraſe
Aims at ſome pretty thought a thouſand ways;—
(Soft its meander, ſave where Vandal force
Of crabbed figures croſs its limpid courſe;
Thoſe imps which make the ſenſes reel, and, zounds!
Miſtake a cypher for a thouſand pounds†;

---

* "Laſt year this pretty little villa ſerved for recreation amidſt the terrible fatigues of office. This year it may do for the enjoyment of philoſophic eaſe, after this hopeful ſprig of ſcience and politics has *reſigned* his unwelcome cares."

† "The troubleſome things, figures, are greatly below the notice of a fine gentleman or a philoſopher; but to attain ſome knowledge of them is rather a neceſſary evil to a Chancellor of the Exchequer. It ſomewhat hurts one's feelings to ſee a miniſter ſtand up in his place, and after a very pretty exordium to the budget, take up a bundle of papers from the table, gaze at the incomprehenſible calculations before him, ſtammer out a few confuſed numbers, and then, with a rueful face, look over his ſhoulder to V—nſ—rt for aſſiſtance. How often have I grieved to ſee unhappy A—d—g—n in this lamentable predicament! How did my heart yearn for explanation, while a young and noble ſtateſman in vain tortured his brains to decypher the mighty plan of finance which he had ſo very *very* prettily

While pitying friends excuſe thy ſtammering jaw,
By humbly pleading thou wer't but cat's paw :—)
Or ſhrinking hear the loud denouncer's call,
Another Felix 'fore another *Paul;*
Quit thy crude meaſure without ſhame or ſorrow,
To-day propoſe it, and retract to-morrow;
Content, though crowds ſhould ſneer, and Cobbett teaze,
To hold thy ſtation, and be quite at eaſe.

" Such wer't not thou. By great ambition led,
To rule in Britain, and on France to tread;
No ſilly joys, the fluttering crowd that fire,
Poſſeſs'd thy heart, or waken'd thy deſire;
One play ſeem'd quite enough in fourteen years*,
And women's ſmiles were paſs'd like actor's tears.
Still full of Britain's fame and Europe's fate,
Days ſpent in buſineſs, nights in ſtrong debate,
By thee no ſports were ſought, no taſteful hours,
Till nature mourn'd o'er thine exhauſted powers;
Saw thy griev'd ſpirit part with many a groan,
More pierc'd by Europe's ills than by thine own.

" In days of yore, when ſtateſmen ſlowly grew,
And circling ſeaſons brought them forth to view;
They ſtudied men, the nation's temper felt,
And deeply ſearch'd where public intereſt dwelt.
Now politicians ſpring like hot bed fruits,
We place the dunghill and the muſhroom ſhoots;
Soak'd for a while in Cam, or Iſis' ſtream,
Where ſport the fiſhes while the draughtſmen dream:
Or warm'd with keener rays of northern light†,
Where youths, like pretty dancers, flaſh and fight;

---

announced! But it has been ſaid that this knowledge of figures is a vulgar acquirement; a thing within the reach of every clerk. Be it ſo—it is the more diſgraceful for our oratorical politicians to be devoid of it. Nothing is more diſguſting than to hear a man ſtammering through a long detail of numbers, which he cannot even read, far leſs connect, or make intelligible to any human underſtanding. There was nothing which brought Mr. Pitt more credit, or in which he more decidedly excelled all his cotemporaries, than the perſpicuity and fluency with which he detailed the moſt complicated calculations. There are few men, indeed, in parliament who can now be heard with patience on any financial topic."

* " When Mr. Pitt went to the political play of Pizarro, it was ſtated to have been the firſt time, for fourteen years, that he had viſited the theatre."

† " This is the uſual denomination and appearance of the rays of the Aurora Borealis."

Where wrangling wits diſpute of Nature's laws,
And find, ye gods! effects without a cauſe*:
Propp'd by young friends who take the hint for ſhouts,
Admire his talk, and cheer him when he ſpouts;
Gaze on his dreſs and eulogize his toes,
And ſnatch the crumbs which, pleas'd, around he throws;
See the young ſtateſman o'er the treaſure tower,
And, like his fellow-inſects, ſhine his hour†."

The bard is more juſt to Mr. Pitt than his annotator. The latter, however, has done greater juſtice to Mr. Fox, whoſe character he has drawn with conſiderable ſkill, and with tolerable impartiality; although he has omitted one or two ſtriking facts, and has preferred one falſe charge againſt him, which it is our duty to confute. He aſſerts, that Mr. Fox "ſupported the property-tax on the principle that men ought, as far as poſſible, to be retained in the ſtation which they have once occupied; and that it is quite as reaſonable the lower orders ſhould be ſtarved, as that the higher ſhould be deprived of their uſual enjoyments." This is both flippant and falſe. Mr. Fox never maintained any ſuch principle, but ſupported the tax, from a conviction of its neceſſity, and from a belief that its operation was as equitable as that of any other tax, equally productive, could be. To charge him, therefore, with ſuch a principle is downright calumny. Beſides, we ſhould be glad to aſk this deciſive annotator, in what way the property-tax could poſſibly tend to ſtarve the *lower orders*, all of whom (at leaſt all who had not more than ſixty pounds a year) were exempted from its operation? But there is a great deal of democratic declamation interſperſed in theſe notes. The conſtruction, too, of the ſentence laſt quoted, is inaccurate. When we talk of ſtations which men *have once* occupied, it implies, that they no longer occupy them; they cannot, therefore, be ſaid to *retain*, or to *be retained*, in them, but to *reſume* them; *retaining* implying actual poſſeſſion of the object to be retained. With theſe

* "Moſt of my readers are acquainted with the famous controverſy about *effect* and *cauſe*, which lately ſet the clergy and the philoſophers of Scotland by the ears. Had the new ſcheme of finance been the invention of its propounder in the Houſe of Commons, we might have ſuppoſed it to have been a germ of this northern ſchool; for there we found a very great *effect*—no leſs than the payment of the national debt and the abolition of taxes—about to be accompliſhed without any diſcernible *cauſe*."

† "Butterflies and others, which have ſplendid wings and ſhort lives."

cautions we ſhall ſubmit the well-drawn character of Mr. Fox to our readers.

"Charles James Fox derived from nature a vigorous capacity, which was early improved by a liberal education. His conceptions were rapid, his fancy brilliant: the indulgence of his father gave him an open and fearleſs addreſs; and a continual intercourſe with the circles of gaiety and faſhion rendered his expreſſion fluent, unconſtrained, and elegant. He ſeemed born an orator, and deſtined by nature to ſhine in the political ſphere. His temper, frank, candid, and generous, was calculated to gain him many friends, and to diſarm the animoſity of every enemy. There was nothing in it to inſpire awe, or to excite miſtruſt; no one was thrown to an uncomfortable diſtance. He ſeemed born to live with eaſe and good humour, and to communicate theſe agreeable feelings to all around him.

"His more advanced education tended to blaſt the fruitful plants which ſhot up in ſo rich a ſoil, and to give room and luxuriance to every weed. His youth was a continued courſe of diſſipation. Thoſe hours of vigour and ardour, which ought to have been ſpent in the labours of the cloſet, were devoted to the gaming table, the amour, the midnight debauch. The habits thus contracted gradually became irreſiſtible. He could only by ſtarts confine himſelf to ſerious ſtudies: he needed diſſipation to refreſh his mind: he became incapable of that ſteady attention to buſineſs, without which it is impoſſible to conduct the affairs of a great and active nation.

"His introduction into political life was not peculiarly fortunate. His father, indeed, enjoyed the reputation of abilities, yet he had ſunk under the talents, and ſtill more under the integrity, of Chatham. But if Fox derived ſome ſtain from his parentage, his own conduct ſeemed not likely to remove the blot; and while men admired the brilliancy of his parts, they wondered and lamented that ſo much genius ſhould be united to ſo little prudence or virtue.

"The unfavourable occurrences which croſſed his political career might ſpring from accident; but they derived new force, from the warmth or the facility of his own temper. During the American war, he had derived much popularity from his reſolute and violent oppoſition to Lord North: but when this nobleman and his friends paſſed over to the party of Fox, and were by him received with his uſual facility and frankneſs, the people looked upon their patriot as guilty of the moſt unprincipled diſhoneſty in thus cordially coaleſcing with the men whom he had juſt purſued with the moſt opprobrious invective. The odium of the coalition continued ever afterwards to hang, like a noxious vapour, upon his brighteſt beams.

"When Great Britain interfered to put a ſtop to the conquering arms of Ruſſia, the friends of monarchy were alarmed and incenſed, when they ſaw Fox not only oppoſe adminiſtration at home, but even carry his zeal ſo far as to ſend abroad an accredited agent to thwart the views of government. During the lamented illneſs of the

ſovereign, his activity drew down upon him a new load of indignation. Men could not look upon the warmeſt friendſhip for the ſon as a ſufficient excuſe for deſerting his duty to the father.

"The French revolution followed cloſe. Fox, in conformity with his principles, applauded the firſt movements of freedom, and the nation united in his ſentiments. The exceſſes which enſued altered the general feelings: the beſt principles became abhorred, when found in the mouths of atrocious villains: and in the ideas of the multitude, Fox became aſſociated with thoſe who ſpoke the ſame language, however different their intentions and actions. The conſternation afterwards diffuſed throughout the kingdom, and the vaſt popularity of his great political antagoniſt, gave a ſtill deeper hold to theſe impreſſions; and no one ſeemed worthy of public truſt, who did not revile Fox as an enemy to his country. His own imprudence was, indeed, ſcarcely leſs fatal to his intereſts, than were the arts of his adverſaries. He gave too free acceſs to men of profligate characters and dark deſigns: He uttered expreſſions too violent at any time, but fooliſh in the extreme amidſt the ferment which then prevailed: He even degraded himſelf to a level with the loweſt demagogues, by haranguing motley mobs in the fields around London. His patriotiſm became more ſuſpected, when he declared his country to be in extreme danger, and then took the unmanly reſolution of abandoning her councils, and conſigning himſelf to eaſe and retirement. Theſe acts are indeed attributed to a facility which led him to yield to men whoſe opinions he ſhould have deſpiſed: but this is only to defend his heart at the expence of his head.

"The ſame lamentable facility ſuddenly eclipſed the rays which began to break forth at his decline. After twenty years of oppoſition, he came into power without ſacrificing his honour; but his firſt act, in the Houſe of Commons, as a miniſter, was the introduction of a bill to enable a colleague to poſſeſs at once two important, rich, and *incompatible* offices. He ſeemed to feel his own degradation: He ſeemed conſcious that he was ſetting at defiance all his former profeſſions, and trampling to duſt all the glory of his life. His countenance reddened, and his voice became choaked, with ſhame and anger, when his adverſaries reminded him of what he wiſhed to forget, and reproached him as the tool of iniquity and avarice. With this initiation, his former principles ſeemed to have vaniſhed. The worſt meaſure of his predeceſſors, the property tax, which he had lately reprobated as the moſt impolitic, unjuſt, and oppreſſive, of all exactions, he now ſupported as an ingenious device, and defended an increaſe of its injuſtice and oppreſſion.

"Morality is too often neglected by the ambitious, as uſeleſs to their advancement: but experience ſhews that the want of a good moral character cannot be compenſated to a ſtateſman by any ſame of talents. The general opinion of Fox's licentiouſneſs was perhaps the greateſt obſtacle to his fortunes, and the glue which made calumnies ſo readily adhere to him. He was even believed to be the principal inſtrument in polluting that ſpring, from which the nati. ı ex-

pected its future happineſs to flow: nor was this ſurmiſe confined to the *vulgar*. So confirmed was the general opinion of his licentiouſneſs, that his adherents, eſpecially in certain diſtant quarters of the Iſland, ſeemed to have aſſumed it as the diſtinguiſhing badge of their party; and youths who profeſſed contempt for religion, and practiſed an unbounded libertiniſm, were there almoſt the only acknowledged Foxites. The moral act, by which he cloſed his gayer career, excited ſcarcely leſs reprehenſion: however reclaimed and meritorious might be the object of his choice, yet it ſeemed too ſhocking to decorum that the wife of a great ſtateſman ſhould be an improper companion for any honeſt matron.

"The mind of Fox was naturally open and liberal; and his principles bore the ſtamp of his diſpoſition. He ſeemed from conviction the aſſertor of popular rights, and a decided enemy to arbitrary government. Yet his principles could not at all times reſiſt either his facility or his warmth; and ſome portion at leaſt of his conſiſtency may be attributed to his permanent ſituation as leader of oppoſition. He was accuſed of rank democracy; but with much injuſtice. He entered political life among the ariſtocracy, and with them cloſed his career. It was by their prevailing influence againſt the crown that he twice became a miniſter; and by them he was ſupported throughout. He was a friend to extenſive ſuffrage; but he knew that the votes of the lower orders muſt ever be at the command of the higher. In power, he had always the intereſt of the ariſtocracy in view. He endeavoured to throw the whole patronage of India into the hands of the Parliament: he ſupported the property tax on the principle that men ought, as far as poſſible, to be retained in the ſtation which they have once occupied; and that it is quite as reaſonable the lower orders ſhould be ſtarved, as that the higher ſhould be deprived of their uſual enjoyments.

"The knowledge of Fox was chiefly of that deſcription which may be drawn from converſation, or from books of eaſy peruſal. In a country whoſe proſperity hinges on the arrangement of its induſtry, whoſe government depends on the ſkilful ſupport of public credit, he acknowledged himſelf ignorant of political economy and finance. He was not deeply verſed in official buſineſs; nor had purſued any ſubject with the accuracy of ſcientific inveſtigation. But in the political hiſtory of his country, in the laws relative to its conſtitution, in the diſpoſitions and views of foreign powers, in the arts which conciliate and lead mankind, his knowledge was perhaps unrivalled by any modern politician.

"His eloquence was the grand foundation of his fame. He had to ſtruggle with the diſadvantages of appearance. His figure was unpromiſing, his motions ungraceful, his voice ſhrill, and his enunciation, at the commencement of his ſpeech, indiſtinct and heſitating. Every thing announced that all was unpremeditated, and that the hearer had nothing to expect but the effuſions of the moment. But as he proceeded, this circumſtance became a ſource of admiration. As he grew warm, his words began to flow; his enunciation became

clear and forcible; his countenance glowed with ardour, and every motion ſpoke the force of his feelings. He haſtened directly to his ſubject: it ſeemed to occupy his whole ſoul, to call forth every power of imagination and judgment. He was irreſiſtibly hurried on by his emotions, and his hearers were hurried along with him. In whatever he ſaid there was an air of candour and earneſtneſs, which carried in it ſcarcely leſs perſuaſion than his words. By the rapidity and ſtrength of his conceptions, he was enabled to place his ſubject in the cleareſt light; and he had an unuſual facility in calling to his aſſiſtance the reſources with which books or converſation had ſupplied him. His wit was very ſucceſsful, and his ſarcaſms peculiarly poignant: they were not delivered with bitterneſs, and they ſeemed always to fall juſtly on the head of their object.

"Yet his eloquence was not free from the vices to which it was naturally ſubjected by his habits. His orations were never regular, never ſkilfully arranged. The hearer, borne along by his warmth, did not diſcover his deſultory tranſitions: but, on recollection, he found it difficult to retrace the maze which he had traverſed. As he always truſted to the moment, his exhibitions depended much on the ſtate of his ſpirits; and it was not uncommon to ſee him labour through a heſitating, devious diſcourſe, which ſcarcely retained the attention of his hearers.

"Even thoſe, who diſliked his politics moſt, admired his diſpoſition. His friends felt towards him a perſonal attachment; and the open frankneſs of his manner often diſarmed political animoſity. He was regarded as the very model of a *true Engliſhman*.

"His early diſſipation and the narrowneſs of his private fortune involved him in perpetual difficulties, which embarraſſed his mind, and often engaged him in a diſagreeable dependence. The expedient of a general contribution of his friends, by which he was at length extricated, gave an irrecoverable blow to his reſpectability. Thoſe eſpecially at a diſtance felt a ſtrange revolution of ſentiment, when the idol of their admiration became a ſuppliant for their alms. Some of his enemies had the cruelty to mortify him by their oſtentatious ſubſcriptions.

"His inviolable attachment to peace was the nobleſt feature in his public character. Even his moſt determined enemies lamented his death, when they ſaw the negociations which had owed their birth entirely to him expire as our only Miniſter of Peace expired."

At the laſt obſerva tion our readers will ſcarcely refrain from a ſmile, particularly when they call to mind the memorable declaration of Mr. Fox on the peace of Amiens, in which he gloried *because* it was favourable to the enemies of his country. Now the author muſt either have concurred with Mr. Fox in this ſentiment, or have differed from him: if the former, it was hypocritical not to declare his concurrence; if the latter, he has been guilty of a culpable omiſſion in not marking his diſſent. Indeed, in wholly forbearing to

notice ſo prominent a feature in the political character of Mr. Fox (particularly, when he beſtowed indiſcriminate praiſes on his peace-loving diſpoſition), he has betrayed his duty, whether he be conſidered as a biographer, or as a portrait painter.

In his next note, on the authority of a mere *on dit*, he accuſes the Britiſh Government of injuſtice and cruelty, for having *forced* the Grand Duke of Tuſcany, the King of Sardinia, and other ſecondary powers, into a war with France. But here, as in ſome other inſtances, he diſplays his humanity at the expence of his integrity, for he either knows, or ought to know, that there is not the ſmalleſt foundation for the fact; and that to libel his own country, is no proof of either patriotiſm or honeſty.

In his portrait of Lord Grenville, the poet praiſes Mr. Fox, at the expence of his Lordſhip, and, in his uſual indirect manner, makes his commendations of the former the vehicle of his ſatirical attacks on the latter; but he is particularly unfortunate in both, for he cenſures Lord G. chiefly for his vigorous meaſures in reſiſting the efforts of France for the ſubjugation of Europe; and in the following lines praiſes Mr. Fox ſo awkwardly, as to give to his praiſe the ſemblance of ſatire.

> "Thou, Fox, didſt never quaff the public ſprings,
> And richly batten on the goodly things;
> From loaves and fiſhes ſeek thy fortune's cure,
> And rather fleece the people than the poor."

Indeed! and did this ſimple bard never hear of a certain *defaulter of unaccounted millions*, no ſmall portion of which was publicly acknowledged to have been ſpent by this diſintereſted patriot? nor of a certain ſinecure, ycleped, *the clerk-ſhip of the pells*, which the ſaid patriot received as a gift from his father, before he had rendered a ſingle ſervice to the ſtate, and which he ſold to pay a gambling debt? Is this *impartial truth*, or *partial ignorance*?

The portrait of Mr. Canning is the moſt contemptible compoſition in the whole collection, both as to matter and to manner. If the poet really entertain the opinion which he declares of Mr. Canning's talents and qualifications, we pity his ignorance; and if he do not, we abhor his duplicity. The natural abilities of Mr. Canning, and the improvement which they have acquired from education and ſtudy, have been acknowledged and proclaimed by the moſt competent judges of both parties. He was educated, too, with a view to a political life; he was early brought into Parliament, and was appointed under-ſecretary to Lord Grenville, in the fo-

reign department, a poſt which he held for ſeveral years. What his conduct has been ſince he has been ſecretary of ſtate, we too fully explained, on a late occaſion, to render the repetition neceſſary to our readers. Suffice it to ſay, that it has been ſuch as completely to contradict all the aſſertions of this writer reſpecting it. But as we have pronounced this compoſition to be ſo contemptible, a regard for "impartial truth" requires that we ſhould lay it before our readers, that *they* may be enabled to judge how far our ſentence is juſt or otherwiſe.

" 'Seven years have paſs'd ſince James's park I've ſeen,
'And Wapping but receiv'd me yeſter-e'en;
'O'er many a wave, to many a diſtant realm,
'I've ſtretch'd the canvas, and I've watch'd the helm;
'Great changes, well I ween, have chanc'd the while,
'Amidſt the mighty pilots of our iſle;
'This morn they brought me a newſpaper in,
'With many a paragraph to raiſe a grin;
'The members too, as uſual, pitch'd their ſtrength;
'Some ſpoke in proverbs, ſome harangued at length;
'There Chanc'lors, Secretaries, told at large
'Their own great merits, and their mighty charge;
'But whence their merits ſprung, or what their name,
'I knew no more than Tchi-tung's men of fame.
'When laſt I left this land, our ruling great
'Were known to ev'ry child in ev'ry ſtate;
'And round the ſkirt of Canton's crazy wall
'Were fam'd as much as in St. Stephen's hall.—
'Say, if thou canſt, what new-ſprung men are theſe,
'That hold earth's ſcales, and rule the lords of ſeas?'

" 'Unhappy thou!' replied the man of pen,
'Who haſt as yet to learn theſe mighty men.
'Since Britain firſt roſe from the ebbing wave,
'No mightier hands were ſtretch'd her realm to ſave;
'No mightier hands her rivals to o'erthrow,
'And fix the fetters on the gnaſhing foe.
'Of great Canino ſure thine ears have heard,
'Fit for a ſtateſman ere he wore a beard;
'Safe 'neath his wing, their all ſcared Britons hold,
'Nor care though lions prowl around the fold.

" 'Bleſt Britain! now thy hour of triumph's nigh,
'O'er ſea and land thy conqu'ring flag ſhall fly!
'But who th' illuſtrious ſire, and princely dame,
'That brought to light the child decreed to fame?'

" 'His ancient pedigree, by records good,
'Reach'd paſt King Arthur, nay, beyond the flood;

'In Rome or Athens had he found his birth,
'His line had ſoar'd beyond the ſons of earth;
'Some god of proweſs vaſt, and am'rous fame,
'Some goddeſs bright, had prov'd his ſire and dame.
'With mother wit to profit e'en by play,
'Through devious paths he well could find his way;
'With wits could toy, and by their aid attain
'Ends they ne'er dreamt of, friends whoſe ſmiles were gain.
'Thus following cloſe, where brilliant fortune led,
'The great Canino lifts on high the head!

"'But ſay what treaſures bear aloft his ſtate,
'What goodly rent-rolls in his train await?
'What independence buoys him o'er the tribe
'That ſell their honour for a lentile bribe?

"'With eye clear-ſighted, and with temper'd fire,
'While prudence fed the glow of young deſire,
'He ſought a bride from Scotland's diſtant hills,
'Where pure ſpring-water leaps in virgin rills,
'Where ſhepherdeſſes boaſt their lily fold,
'And ſometimes, not leſs pleas'd, their ſaffron gold.
'Hence came the fair that bleſs'd Canino's arms,
'With caſh and beauty, paradiſal charms!
'Pure, ſpotleſs, was the wealth from that pure clime
'Where children ſhine not by a parent's crime;
'Unlike the treaſures bought with barter'd fame,
'Torn from the wretch amidſt the midnight game—
'Who, then awaking, ſtarts with curdling blood,
'To think his infants ſoon ſhall gaſp for food:
'A dungeon drear his years forlorn attend—
'Then flies from fancy to a direful end!
'While the cool murd'rer now, around his bed,
'Sees ruin'd phantoms at dark midnight tread;
'And, bolts and bars unfit his ſoul to ſcreen,
'He madly haſtes to join the griſly ſcene;
'That wealth, for which he ſold his peace, reſign'd,
'Left to his heirs, and ſcatter'd on the wind.
'Far diff'rent gains Canino's ſtate uphold,
'No ſpot is ſeen to dim the virtuous gold.

"'Thus crown'd with wealth, what pow'rs our hopes await,
'What mighty talents to ſupport the ſtate?'

"'Aſk you his pow'rs whoſe fame has fill'd the world,
'And in the cabinet its flags unfurl'd?
'Who never fails his cheering friends to charm,
'So loud, ſo long, ſo very firm, ſo warm?
'But far o'er all his talents ſoars his wit,
'Wit never giv'n to Fox, nor caught by Pitt!

'By this our realm o'er foreign foes ſhall riſe,
'And tread on him who heav'n and earth defies.
'Napoleon fierce can face an Auſtrian gun,
'Nor from a hairy Coſſack flinching run;
'Can trot at leiſure 'midſt the whizzing balls,
'And almoſt rub againſt the hoſtile walls;—
'But this great hero, pierc'd by pointed words,
'Grows ſoft as lath, and pale as Suffolk curds;
'A pun confounds him, and a ſmart conceit,
'Or epigram ſevere, yet wondrous neat,
'Will lay the braggart proſtrate at our feet!
'Such are the powers by which Canino's hand
'Shall chaſe the proud uſurper from his land.
'If F——re* can tag a rhyme, and G—f—d ſtill
'Can turn a period with a placeman's quill,
'Canino's ſtores ſhall then come forth with grace,
'At every point a magazine he'll place,
'Where'er Napoleon turns his ruffian face.
'Lo! 'gainſt his front the laden Coſſack brings
'The Engliſh ſubſidy, *fierce verbal ſtings;*
'While weſt, ſouth, north, well marſhall'd in his rear,
'With *accents* dire the tirailleurs appear!
'With keen barb'd darts ſtuck round, ſhall fume the beaſt,
'Like baited bulls at far-fam'd Spaniſh feaſt;
'Till, quite o'ercome, he'll lay him down and die—
'Then be it mine to ſpread abroad the joy;
'For, Sir,——Canino's S——t——y *I!*"

In the note here quoted, and in others, the learned tranſlator of Juvenal is attacked as a *placeman*, a *paraſite*, and a *tool of Government*, for ſuch, ſubſtantially, is the ſum of the charges preferred againſt him, or they mean nothing. Now, we ſhould be glad to learn what all the clamour againſt placemen, which pervades the whole of this part of the volume, means? Is the author prepared to contend that Government can be carried on without places? Certainly not; indeed, he admits, that "It is not the legal emoluments of the *efficient offices* that are enormous; they are in many inſtances too ſmall." It cannot then be diſhonourable to hold theſe neceſſary offices; and no man is a fair ſubject for cenſure who

* "The firſt of theſe wits has become a celebrated diplomatiſt, as the world has heard. The ſecond is a wit of a ſuperior ſtamp; and much did the A————n owe to its editor. It is very eaſy to write pretty epigrams when they paſs through the hands of ſuch a corrector. He now enjoys the rewards of his labours in a tolerable ſtreamlet from the river of public ſweets. He will now again be probably called into action."

holds them, unleſs he is unfit for them, or derives from them *illegal emoluments*. Now, by applying this principle to the gentleman in queſtion, it will be ſeen how groſsly unfounded and unjuſt the cenſures on him are. He holds two ſmall offices; one in the Exchequer, which produces the *enormous* ſum of 80l. a year, and the other, that of a commiſſioner of the lottery, which yields, we believe, between two and three hundred. He fulfils the duties of them both punctually and conſcientiouſly; and there can be no reaſon to ſuppoſe that he is not every way qualified to hold them. Such is "the tolerable ſtreamlet from the river of public ſweets," for the poſſeſſion of which a man is to be charged, by an anonymous writer, with having ſacrificed his integrity, his honour, and his independence. Such infamous calumny merits the ſevereſt chaſtiſement. If Mr. G. has promulgated, in his writings, principles or doctrines falſe or dangerous, let them be confuted and corrected. But let not any foul-mouthed calumniator preſume to tax him with ſervility, becauſe he happens to hold two inconſiderable poſts. The fact is, that there exiſts not a man of more upright and independent principles and conduct, a man more generally and more deſervedly eſteemed, or a man more incapable of ſacrificing his principles to his intereſt, than Mr. William Gifford.

In one of the notes annexed to the above portrait of Mr. Canning there are ſome excellent reflections on the deſtructive vice of gaming; but what relation the anecdote which it contains has to Mr. Canning, it is not poſſible to conceive. Our limits compel us to paſs over without notice many of the characters and many of the paſſages which we had marked for our animadverſion. Of the former, that of Mr. Sheridan is the beſt drawn; but it is too long to extract wholly, and we ſhall therefore only lay ſome parts of it before our readers.

"At times Dame Nature, in a bounteous mood,
A ſoil prepares for any produce good;
There yellow harveſts may luxuriant ſhoot,
There on the vine may ſwell the cluſt'ring fruit;
There, if neglected, every weed deſign'd
The ſloth to chaſten of the lingering hind,
The nettle, briar, thiſtle, dock may grow,
And far and wide the yellow ragwort blow.

"In any calling might Tigellius ſhine,
The moving orator, the bard divine;
Rule as the ſtateſman, as the wit enchant,
Such powers did Nature to her favourite grant.

Tigellius felt the boon; and, all by turns,
The wit, the bard, the orator, he burns;
Scarce for a day his lov'd purſuit the ſame,
And ſtill deſerting ere he wins the game.

" To rival Shakſpeare ſee his genius riſe,
His taſte excels, his wit with Shakſpeare vies:
Yet ſee the pigmy monument he rears!—
Two plays are all the work of thirty years;
Save one burleſque* to mock the Bavian throng,
One maudlin farce, mere vehicle for ſong†.
At length, deſerting genius, ſee him job
A German tragedy to pleaſe the mob;
Prop with ſmart crutch Anne Plumptre's‡ hobbling ſtyle,
And of its bloſſoms the Gazette‖ deſpoil;
With royal ravings make the ſcene abſurd§,
And turn Ataliba to George the Third;

---

* " Such burleſques are not without their utility; and, if tolerably executed, are always amuſing. The genius which they require is not however of the firſt rate, for ſeveral have been ſucceſsful. The chief praiſe is given to the inventor of this mode of writing; and the author of the Rehearſal will therefore always be more noted than the author of the Critic."

† " I believe few have ſeen the Duenna, when well acted, without pleaſure; and I believe as few have read it with pleaſure. A good actor may make ſomething both of the incidents and the dialogue; but in the cloſet, 'little Iſaac' is almoſt as dull as the unaccountable appendage Don Carlos. As a vehicle for ſongs, however, it may be ſo ſo, as times go: but, alas! is it from the author of the School for Scandal that we ought to expect *mere vehicles?*"

‡ " This lady is well known throughout the nation as the faithful retailer in Engliſh of whatever Kotzebue chooſes to pour forth in German. She has tranſlated all his plays and travels—incomparable induſtry! and at a rate ſo moderate, as her publiſher will acknowledge, that ſhe muſt either be much in love with the work, or miſerably tired of it."

‖ " The reader is aware that all thoſe loyal addreſſes, in which the worthy citizens of our corporations breathe out warm devotions at the foot of the throne, are inſerted in the Gazette. Whether ſome celebrated ſpeeches delivered at Drury-lane, from the pen of a great poet, do not bear a ſtriking reſemblance, in ſentiment and ſtyle, to the uſual ſtrain of theſe addreſſes, the knowing reader is left to determine."

§ " There is nothing which more certainly and readily diſguſts us with the dainties of which we are moſt fond, than to be obliged to ſwallow them in large quantities on every occaſion. No one will diſtruſt the powers which I, or any other Engliſhman poſſeſs, of digeſting loyal effuſions in the theatre. In this way we have all moſt invincible ſtomachs. Yet it muſt be acknowledged that of late we have

Pizarro ſet to Buonaparte's d——d work,
While Rolla repreſents his Grace of York!
O loyal bard! O labours not in vain!
As tells the treaſurer's box of Drury-lane;
Whate'er Whig* bumpers cool thy loyal heat,
A patriot thou to Drury and the Fleet†!
Once more burſts forth bright genius ere it cloſe,
And, join'd with Johnſtone‡, can a ſhow compoſe;
The walks of Shakſpeare and of Farquhar leaves,
And in a cavern hides with *Forty Thieves.*"

Theſe obſervations, both of the poet and his annotator, are very good, and entitled to that praiſe, which we, moſt

---

had the dainty adminiſtered in ſuch unreaſonable proportions, that to *reliſh* it at leaſt is more than can be expected from us. I could mention ſome ſcore of plays, and twice as many farces, which have come forward with the ſole merit of an abundant proviſion of loyal clap-traps. This is taking advantage of loyalty with a vengeance. It muſt, like charity, cover a multitude of iniquities—the want of wit, intereſt, and common ſenſe. The play of Pizarro has the merit of being among the firſt dramas in which loyal ſentimentality was turned to ſuch exceſſive good account. But if its glowing ſpeeches raiſed the patriotiſm of the nation, they certainly have as much debaſed its taſte; and after its great popularity, we have little reaſon to look for nature and ſimplicity in any ſerious dramatic performance. Did ever the ſavages of Peru ſpeak in ſuch a manner? But indeed the ſentiments are the property of no nation, nor of any race, under Heaven."

* "It cannot be forgotten that at the Whig Club (a ſociety which have the honour of perpetuating a party diſtinction, a century after the ground of its exiſtence is removed) it became faſhionable, ſome years ago, to omit that antiquated toaſt *The King*. The ſubſtitute was the *Sovereignty of the People*. But in Drury-lane, it was found convenient to hold different ſentiments, and to drink his Majeſty's health with every bumper."

† "Our readers will recollect a famous patriotic exhibition which took place during the mutiny at the Nore, which will be preſently alluded to in its proper place."

‡ "Johnſtone, the machiniſt of Drury-lane theatre, a moſt ingenious man, and one of the beſt *play-wrights* of the age. Without his aſſiſtance, what would become of our heroes of the north, our wood demons, and other reſpectable perſonages of the ſame claſs? In the compoſition of a Pantomimic Operatic Tragedy, the favourite drama of the day, the labour of the poet is one of the leaſt things to be conſidered.

" 'Dixit ad huc aliquid? Nil ſane. Quid placet ergo?
'Lana Tarentino violas imitata colore.' "

cheerfully, beſtow on them. In the following ſhort note, alluding to the magiſterial repreſentative of Mr. Sheridan, at his theatre, there is ſome wit and point.

"This Aaron, although not the brother of Moſes, is a perſonage not leſs formidable to the *Egyptians*. His rod is in their eyes a very ſerpent. It was a practical, though rather a biting illuſtration of that law, which includes players among rogues and vagabonds, when a police magiſtrate was made the active manager of Drury lane."

This is one of the two magiſtrates whom Mr. Sheridan thought proper, from very obvious motives, to exempt from his general attack, in the Houſe of Commons, in the body of police magiſtrates, to which *they* do not belong. The concluding part of this character is equally entitled to praiſe with the former.

"While ſome to compaſs gold all comfort croſs,
Tigellius knows to live without the droſs:
Bleſt ſcience ſure to all whoſe fund's in doubt,
Thrice bleſt to thoſe whoſe credit's fairly out!
Yet things there are which fill the ſtout with dread,
And raiſe a megrim in the ſoundeſt head;
Even gallant ſoldiers ſcarce can uſe their feet,
While duns and tipſtaffs eye them in the ſtreet:
But Britain's ſtatutes, kind to men of ſpirit,
Some refuge yet provide for drooping merit;
A ſhrine there is, from duns a ſafe retreat,
Nor ſhut from wit or gold, yclep'd a *feat*;
This ſhrine who touches may his cares forego,
And, owing thouſands, nothing ſeem to owe;
Then tradeſmen vile, who dare to claim their own*,
Shall, ſad, for breach of privilege atone.

---

* "It is neceſſary to inveſt all public functions with certain privileges, in order to render them an object of deſire. The affairs of the nation would otherwiſe find no one to carry them on, unleſs a few idle perſons, who might undertake them for God's ſake. That privilege, which exempts the members of the Houſe of Commons from paying their debts (for the lords derive the ſame exemption from *nature*) is peculiarly well adapted for giving eſtimation to a ſeat in that aſſembly. It is unqueſtionable that he who has to chuſe between the King's Bench and St. Stephen's Chapel will conceive a violent predilection for the latter. Perſons alſo, who fly to the Legiſlature as a ſanctuary, muſt ever be conſidered as beſt adapted to the public ſervice, having no private concerns to manage, and being entirely diſengaged from thoſe cares of wealth which ſo miſerably embarraſs the public mind. They are, in ſhort, the men to do any thing, to be pleaſed with any thing; for any thing is better than nothing.

" The friend of genius, patron of young worth,
Tigellius might have call'd new Shakſpeares forth;
With wreathes himſelf had foſter'd, crown'd the ſtage,
A fam'd Mecænas in an iron age.
Alas! though his to judge, though his to give,
To public fame, the ſcenes that ought to live,
To him what genius owns his honours due?
Whom has his foſt'ring bounty brought to view?
The title read, away the paper toſt,
Again unlook'd for, and at length quite loſt;
The fruits of toil, the hopes of youth are thrown,
While the poor author vents the fruitleſs moan*.
'Twas thus, unhappy Tobin, ſunk thy heart,
With genius gifted, and the poet's art;
Thy golden ſcenes neglected like thyſelf,
Were left to moulder on the umpire's ſhelf;
No praiſe beſtow'd of all ſo juſtly due,
No path vouchſaf'd to lead thee forth to view;
Till Nature, faint, with wounded Genius fell,
And wak'd a patron by the funeral knell;
Then came rewards, to thee no longer came,
And fruitleſs honours ſhower'd around thy name†.

Their perſeverance is not likely to be overcome, nor their courage to be ſubdued by popular clamours:—

Virtus repulſæ neſcia ſordidæ,
* * * § * *
Nec ſumit aut ponit ſecures,
Arbitrio popularis auræ.

It is fair that the legiſlators, who make the laws, ſhould, in ſome inſtances, exempt themſelves from the power of theſe creatures of their own hands."

* " This melancholy truth has been atteſted to me by many inſtances; and I may ſafely aſſert that it is to ſuch conduct the preſent poverty of dramatic genius is almoſt entirely owing. The negligence with which every production of this ſort was treated, by the manager alluded to, has become proverbial. 'O, if it had got into Mr. S.'s hands, it will never get out of them,' every player will tell you with a ſmile. There is ſomething more than a blamable indolence, there is cruelty and injuſtice, in this conduct. Many a young dramatic author, whoſe genius would have given pleaſure to the public, and brought profit to the theatre, has by this means been cruſhed, and too much diſpirited ever to reſume his labours. A man who, through the mere love of eaſe and diſſipation, can act in this manner, may be a man of taſte and genius, but he certainly wants ſome *better qualities*."

† " The fate of poor Tobin, although his caſe was by no means ſingular, will be a laſting ſtain on the preſent management of our

" Tigellius is not cruel, harſh, unkind,
To blaſt young genius never once deſign'd;
In mere good wiſhes will he yield to none,
And only fails—*when ſomething's to be done.*
Nay, ſometimes rous'd, he has been known to aid,
With active zeal, a brilliant maſquerade;
To puff a Chriſtmas ſhow into renown,
Or play a Roſcius off upon the town*:
But great occaſions only call him forth,
Not common things, like young unfriended worth.

" But night draws on, and darkneſs haſtes to hide
Unfruitful talents, genius miſapplied;
Fame without reverence; age without reſpect,
Doom'd to regret, and ſinking to neglect.
Doom'd, after years miſpent, to make a ſhow,
And catch the multitude however low,
To feel the want of power e'en mobs to move,
And, at the Huſtings, purgatory prove†;
Enrag'd, indignant, fill'd with grief and ſpleen,
He cloſes, wretched cloſe! the heartleſs ſcene."

---

theatres, particularly that theatre to which his plays were offered. He could not even ſucceed in getting his pieces once read by the only perſon, belonging to the theatre, who was capable of perceiving their merits. He died at an early age, under all the depreſſion of poverty and diſappointment. The diſcovery which ſome perſons made, that his pieces might be profitable to the theatre, at length procured the repreſentation of two of them; but a third, the moſt intereſting of all, was kept back from a paltry apprehenſion that it might not be acceptable to a female friend of the m——r! What ſcandalous trifling with genius, both alive and dead! A jovial dinner with the players will never prove this man a friend of the drama."

* " No one in the ſecret expected that the hoax would take to the degree it did. But the ſcheme was laid with too deep knowledge of a London audience to fail. All the newſpapers were engaged; expectation was on the tiptoe; Fox and Pitt were both to ſee the phenomenon in one night! The contrivance was admirable, and the ſucceſs was accordingly. But the moſt remarkable circumſtance was to ſee the knowing ones next winter taken in. Could it be expected that the hoax ſhould not have been found out in a whole twelvemonth? What calculations are made on the ſtupidity of mankind! O cæci homines!"

† " Nothing can be a more cruel diſappointment than for a man, who has devoted his life (I mean as far as the love of eaſe and pleaſure would allow him) to court popularity, at length to come forward, in full confidence, to harangue a great popular aſſembly, and inſtead of applauſes, find himſelf received with hiſſes and hootings. The poet here calls them *purgatory*:—he might have given them a worſe name."

We ſhall juſt obſerve, here, that this patriot, who did not bluſh, on the huſtings, to boaſt of his *independence*, and to prate about *patriotiſm*, did not dare to ſhew his face there, until the protection or the pity of one of the leaders of his *faction* had ſecured him from arreſt by *ordering* him to be returned for a venal borough. As to the *privileges* of the Houſe of Commons, though originally, and wiſely, granted for public purpoſes, they are now ſo flagrantly perverted to private and intereſted purpoſes, that it is high time they ſhould undergo both reviſion and reform. The abuſe of Lord Melville it would be a waſte of time to confute, after the complete juſtification of his Lordſhip which appeared in former numbers of this work. In a note, Mr. Pitt is, moſt falſely, aſſerted to have abandoned the cauſe of parliamentary reform, after he came into power, when it is very well known that all his eloquence was exerted to promote it; though his *opinion* was altered reſpecting the queſtion, at a ſubſequent period of his life.

The following remarks on the conduct of the King, in rendering the Judges independent, are very juſt, though the ſame neceſſity for rendering the office of Lord Chancellor permanent does not exiſt.

"It was an inſtance of patriotiſm in a king, never to be forgotten, when his preſent majeſty, at his acceſſion, renounced for himſelf, and his ſucceſſors for ever, the power of diſplacing the judges at the commencement of a new reign. Such a voluntary ſacrifice of a prerogative, however unprofitable to the poſſeſſor, has rarely been made by the moſt virtuous ſovereigns. While the judges of the common law are, by this laſt conceſſion, rendered wholly independent of the fluctuation of political parties, it muſt be a matter of wonder and regret, that the ſupreme judge in equity, who in many inſtances controuls all the others, ſhould hold his office entirely by the precarious tenure of party. If the independence of judges be a benefit, this is an evil of the firſt magnitude. If it be allowed that the variegated duties of the Lord Chancellor are more than any one man can fulfil, why then delay to remedy at once ſo many evils, by ſimply ſeparating his functions? Let the patronage and the political ſtation be attached to the Speaker of the Houſe of Lords, and let his office be an ample boon for the active partizans of each ſucceſsful faction. But let the ſupreme judge of our courts of equity be fixed in his ſtation for life. Let him enjoy that full independence which is given to every other judge: let no avocation, but the complicated buſineſs of that function, occupy his mind: Let neither hope nor fear diſtract his attention, or hold out even the ſlighteſt temptation to ſwerve from the plain line of his duty."

The degrading cuſtom which prevails, among the fops and

fools of faſhion, of changing places with their coachmen and grooms, is very properly reprobated.

"It has now become a matter of faſhion to render the peer as indiſtinguiſhable from the coachman as poſſible. They wear the ſame dreſs, ſwear the ſame oaths, are often ſeen in the ſtable and on the coach-box together; and, in ſhort, are, to all appearance, exactly of the ſame fraternity. Nay, the coachman is frequently ſeen to occupy the place of my lord in the curricle, by the ſide of my lady; and, in truth, is at times not the leaſt proper man of the two. It was obſerved, by a celebrated Scottiſh philoſopher, that, in a few centuries, the progeny of the man in the chariot, and of the man on the coach-box, change places. The preſent cuſtoms will probably render the rotation frequently much more ſpeedy."

The character of the *Cit* turned *Lord* is handled with great propriety. We ever thought that particular creation highly diſgraceful, for various reaſons, and we ſtill continue of the ſame opinion. Though it be of the eſſence of the conſtitution, that its honours ſhould be acceſſible by every claſs of his Majeſty's ſubjects, yet both the dignity of the crown, and the credit of the peerage, demand, that great caution ſhould be obſerved in the beſtowal of them; and, certainly, that ſomething more than mere wealth ſhould be required as a neceſſary qualification. There is much juſtice in the author's remarks on the increaſe of the monied ariſtocracy.

The contemptuous manner in which Mr. Maurice is mentioned, reflects diſgrace only on the author, who diſplays, at once, his malice and his ignorance. His Indian Hiſtory and Antiquities have procured him, from this lover of "impartial truth," the character of a "laborious collector of old women's fables." From all real lovers of truth, however, theſe works will obtain for their author a very different character. They diſplay deep and laborious reſearch, great erudition, a highly cultivated mind, and a ſound and correct judgment; and they afford ſome very ſtrong corroborating teſtimonies of the truth of the Moſaic hiſtory, and of the Chriſtian religion. As to the aſſertion, that "to the aſtoniſhment of his friends and the public he (Mr. Maurice) ſuddenly became a poet," it proves nothing but the annotator's ignorance: for the firſt productions of Mr. Maurice's pen were poems; and his poetical works (though he has not been always equally fortunate in the ſelection of his ſubjects) may claſs among the beſt of the preſent age. The note-maker's comments are not criticiſm, but mere low, vulgar abuſe.

We muſt now draw our ſtrictures to a cloſe, although this

"Male Book" affords much more food for critical animadverſion. The ſpecimens which we have exhibited are ſufficient, we think, to juſtify our aſſertion, that it is greatly inferior in talent to the "Female Book;" and this obſervation will apply equally to the poetry and the proſe. The portrait of Mr. Canning, as well as many features of others, is as very a daub as ever the pencil of a Grub-ſtreet painter preſented to the public. Wherever the author deſcants on morals, he is correct; but his religious principles, as far as we can form a conjecture of them from the deſultory obſervations which occur in various parts, appear leſs ſound; and his political opinions are highly objectionable. There is a ſlovenlineſs in the poetry utterly inexcuſable in one who is capable of writing ſo much better, as our readers well know by the copious extracts which we made from the firſt part of the "Epics" in a former number. For this ſtrange inferiority, in the productions of the ſame pen, we are wholly at a loſs to account. The following inſtances of inattention in his *rhymes* will ſerve as a ſpecimen of his general careleſſneſs in the delineation of his *male* characters.

Float, wrought; await, debt; tongue, wrong; heaven, driven; fed, clad; joy, I; forſake, neck; pin, machine; hoard, lord; front, account; raiſed, debaſed; drivel, devil; advance, once; Macbeth, heath; evils, drivels; ſpeech, H; fêtes, treats.

Such a line as the following affords another proof of careleſſneſs unpardonable in a man who can write ſo well.

"An uſeful ſupport, but a ſhapeleſs block."

Our ſerious advice to the author is to ſeparate "The Female Book" from "The Male Book;" but probably he will not follow it, as he may think the former a neceſſary paſſport for the latter, and the latter an uſeful foil to the former; and we are compelled to admit, that the one requires a paſſport, though the other wants no foil.

The Subſtance of Additional Obſervations, INTENDED *to have been delivered in the Houſe of Commons, in the Debate on the Petition of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, on the 13th and 14th of May,* 1805, *by* Sir J. C. Hippiſley, Bart. 8vo. Faulder. 1805.

THE deſign of the author of this pamphlet, is, to prove the policy and expediency of giving the Roman Catholics of

the empire an equal ſhare of civil liberty and political power with their Proteſtant fellow ſubjects. Had he taken the ſalutary hint given by Mr. Alexander, in his ſpeech on the ſame ſubject, and which he quotes in page 120 of this his *Intended* Speech, he never would have publiſhed it* : for he betrays a radical ignorance of the baneful doctrines of the Romiſh Church, nay, he denies their exiſtence, or that they were ever fatal to the peace and ſecurity of Proteſtant ſtates. His work, therefore, is a libel on the juſtice and wiſdom, not only of the Britiſh Government, but of every Proteſtant ſtate in Europe, which have uniformly found themſelves under an imperious neceſſity of impoſing penal reſtrictions on Roman Catholics for their own preſervation. His arguments are ſophiſtical and fallacious, for they are founded on what logicians call *petitio principii*, and in inferences drawn from unfounded aſſumptions. We are unwilling to aſcribe his intemperate zeal to unworthy motives; at the ſame time we think it right to inform him, that the Iriſh Papiſts, through their committee, conſtantly ſitting in Dublin, raiſe, annually, very large ſums of money on their body at large, to promote the intereſts of their religion; and that they have never failed to reward, out of this fund, ſuch perſons as have been warm advocates in their cauſe. This is unequivocally proved by the reports of the ſecret committees of the Iriſh Houſes of Lords and Commons, publiſhed in the years 1793, 1797, and 1798. The Catholic committee themſelves acknowledge, in a ſtatement of their accounts, printed in Dublin, by their order, on the 25th of April, 1793, that among other boons which they beſtowed on their friends, they gave the ſum of 2321l. to Mr. Richard Burke, who was a zealous propagandiſt of Iriſh Popery, in the years 1791, 1792, and 1793†. When, therefore, an Engliſh Proteſtant gentleman, unconnected with Ireland either by property or conſanguinity, diſplays ſuch ardent zeal in the cauſe of Iriſh Popery, as he does, let him beware leſt the public may ſuſpect that he is actuated by ſiniſter motives, which we are very far from imputing to him.

---

* "I agree, however, with the ſame honourable and learned member in a conviction that 'without a knowledge of the Catholic doctrines, and of the influence of thoſe doctrines, the queſtion cannot be fairly underſtood; and that wilful or aſſumed ignorance of their opinions is unjuſtifiable, in a gentleman agitating ſuch a queſtion.'"

† In the ſame ſtatement they mention large ſums of money given by them to Theobald W. Tone, Simon Butler, and Wm. Todd Jones.

Sir J. C. Hippiſley declares that his deſign in recommending this meaſure is to ſtrengthen the empire, by forming a cordial union and a warm co-operation of the Roman Catholics with their Proteſtant fellow ſubjects. Hiſtory and experience ſhould be the only guide to ſtateſmen; and if our author has recourſe to the annals of every Proteſtant ſtate of Europe, he will find, that the deep-rooted diſloyalty of Papiſts, and their envenomed hatred towards their Proteſtant fellow ſubjects, appeared terrific and alarming long before any penal laws were impoſed on them; and that they were the conſequence, and not the cauſe, of their diſaffection. The hiſtory of Ireland will alone afford him very wiſe leſſons on this ſubject; for its Popiſh ſubjects experienced no privations till after the revolution, and but very few of them till the reigns of Anne and George I. Nevertheleſs, for 160 years previous to that period, they uniformly manifeſted a determination to ſubvert the conſtitution, to perſecute their Proteſtant fellow ſubjects, and to ſeparate their native country from England, with the aid of her foreign enemies, which they never failed to ſolicit*. The penal laws paſſed in Ireland were but tranſcripts of thoſe paſſed in the Britiſh Parliament; but with this very ſtriking difference, that the latter were infinitely more ſevere than the former. The Engliſh Papiſts were liable to pay double taxes; from which the Iriſh were exempt. While the penal laws exiſted, the Iriſh Papiſts were tolerably peaceable and obedient; but ever ſince their repeal, their conduct has been as exceptionable as it was previous to their enactment. Lord Clare, therefore, very juſtly obſerves, in his ſpeech, made on the 13th of March, 1793, in the Iriſh Parliament, "the penal laws enacted in this country, to abridge the power and influence of the old Iriſh Catholics, was a code forced upon the Parliament of Ireland by hard neceſſity; a code which was dictated by ſelf-defence and ſelf-preſervation, and has from time to time been relaxed with open and unſuſpecting liberality; a code, to which I do not ſcruple to ſay, Ireland ſtands indebted, in a great meaſure, for her tranquillity, during the laſt century†." Previous to the year 1793, the Iriſh Papiſts, by the gradual repeal of the penal reſtrictions, enjoyed a more perfect, and a more extenſive ſyſtem of civil liberty, than the moſt favoured ſubjects of any ſtate in Europe. In the year

* The laſt twenty-five years they have uniformly purſued the ſame line of conduct, which proves that they have ſtill the ſame principles and propenſities.

† How much the reverſe ſince it has been repealed!

1793, beſides obtaining the elective franchiſe, they were put on the ſame footing with Proteſtants, except being excluded from a few offices in the executive government, and in the confidential departments of the ſtate. They were at that time, and are now, in poſſeſſion of much more civil liberty than the Engliſh Papiſts, beſides the elective franchiſe, which the latter do not enjoy. And yet the remainder of the year 1793, the Iriſh Papiſts were conſtantly in a ſtate of inſurrection, committing in many parts of Ireland the moſt barbarous outrages, attacking the King's troops at noon day, when on their march, depriving the Proteſtants of their arms, and murdering ſuch of them as made any reſiſtance. In ſhort, a ſyſtematic plan of treaſonable combination, of outrage and murder, continued from the beginning of the year 1793, and conſtantly increaſing in extent and malignity, till the eruption of the dreadful rebellion on the night of the 23d of May, 1798; when it appeared that the main object of the Popiſh rebels was, the complete exciſion of their Proteſtant fellow ſubjects. It was diſcovered in the beginning of the year 1794 that Theobald W. Tone, agent of the Catholic committee, was deeply concerned in a negotiation with the French government, under Robeſpierre, to induce the French to ſend troops to invade Ireland. It was proved by the report of the ſecret committee of the Houſe of Lords, publiſhed in the beginning of the year 1793, that the Defenders, a Popiſh banditti, concerned in theſe ſcenes of rebellious outrage, were ſecretly encouraged by the Catholic committee, who raiſed large ſums annually on their body at large to purchaſe arms and ammunition for them. And yet, to the eternal diſgrace of the Iriſh government, that repreſentative body, that brought ſuch calamities upon Ireland, was ſuffered to aſſemble and debate, and even to parley with the executive government, in the years 1804 and 1805, and again in the year 1806; though their aſſembling was contrary to the convention law, propounded and framed by that able ſtateſman, Lord Clare, and enacted in the year 1793. Such were the effects of a futile attempt to conciliate the Iriſh Papiſts, by making ſuch conceſſions to them. Lord Clare, the Lord Chancellor of Ireland, in his ſpeech, made in the Houſe of Lords, on the 19th of February, 1798, ſaid, "If conciliation be a pledge of national tranquillity and contentment, if it be a ſpell to allay popular ferment, there is not a nation in Europe in which it has had ſo fair a trial as in the kingdom of Ireland. For a period nearly of twenty years, a liberal and unvaried ſyſtem of conceſſion and conciliation has been purſued and acted upon by the Britiſh government.

Conceſſion and conciliation have produced only a freſh ſtock of grievances, and the diſcontents of Ireland have kept pace with her proſperity." Sir J. C. Hippiſley, and ſome of *his conciliating coadjutors*, have, in their ſpeeches in Parliament, ſeverely cenſured Doctor Duigenan, for mentioning in debate the general councils of the Romiſh Church, and the deleterious doctrines contained in them, without conſidering that all the ſuperinduced tenets of that Church, which are repugnant to evangelical truth, and which laid Proteſtant ſtates under a neceſſity, for ſelf-preſervation, of ſubjecting its votaries to certain privations, becauſe they had proved to be fatal to their peace and ſecurity, are to be found excluſively in thoſe general councils. It would be as abſurd, then, to cenſure any alluſions made to them, in a debate in Parliament, on the principles of Popery, as to condemn any alluſion to, or inferences drawn from, Magna Charta, the habeas corpus act, or the bill of rights, when the Britiſh conſtitution was the ſubject of diſcuſſion. We ſhall ſtate the very words of Sir J. C. Hippiſley, in pages 3 and 4, which will appear in the ſequel to be a complete refutation of his own arguments in favour of the Romaniſts.

"If the tenets and opinions held by Roman Catholics were really ſuch as the learned member really aſſerts them to be, and if his deductions from the doctrines maintained by general councils, as well as individual pontiffs, were to be admitted as conſtituting the rules of their conduct, there would be no queſtion, but that the prayer of the petition before us ought to be wholly rejected; and ſo far from conceding great privileges to Catholics, I ſhould be tempted almoſt to agree with the learned gentleman, in his eulogy on *the wiſdom of the Popery code, and the folly of repealing it**."

He then ſays,

"But with perfect deference to the motives of that learned gentleman, I cannot but ſee this queſtion in a very different point of view, and with *all the application* of my humble talents, *aided by long and intimate habits*, at a former period of my life†, with thoſe who were *the higheſt living authorities*‡ on ſuch ſubjects, I cannot but form

---

* The reader is requeſted to carry in his recollection theſe admiſſions, when we ſhall prove the dangerous doctrines of the general councils, and that they have been maintained and acted on in our times.

† It appears from different parts of his work, by his own confeſſion, that he has been many years a zealous aſſertor of the cauſe of Popery.

‡ This alludes to many Roman Catholic Biſhops in Italy, Great

very different ideas of the canons and proceedings of thoſe general councils*, which are ſo much excepted againſt by the learned gentleman, as well as the reſcripts of thoſe pontiffs who have fallen under his animadverſion."

We ſhall lay before the Britiſh public a brief, but accurate, ſtatement of ſome of the doctrines contained in the general councils and canons of the Romiſh Church, which are univerſally deemed immutable, from their infallibility; and we ſhall prove that this is maintained in the moſt poſitive manner by ſome of the moſt eminent Romiſh diviñes of the preſent times, whom our author calls *the higheſt living authorities*†, and whoſe encomiums on the Popiſh religion, contained in letters written to himſelf, he quotes as an unqueſtionable teſt of the excellence and purity of its doctrines. If, in the accompliſhment of this important duty, we detain the attention of our readers longer than uſual, we hope that they will excuſe us, when we remind them, that there is a powerful faction at this time in both iſlands, who are uſing the moſt ſtrenuous efforts to eſtabliſh, in the moſt unlimited manner, a ſuperſtition, at all times hoſtile to civil liberty, and whoſe votaries have often attempted to ſubvert the Britiſh conſtitution, in conſequence of their blind and devoted attachment to a foreign Prince.

Sir J. C. Hippiſley is actuated by ſuch intemperate zeal, that he enters into an analyſis of the doctrines of the Romiſh Church, with thoſe of the Britiſh, and endeavours to prove that they are full as well calculated to promote ſocial harmony under a Proteſtant ſtate.

It is decreed by the 4th Lateran council, canon 3d, apud Bincum, that "all ſecular powers, what offices ſoever they enjoy, ſhall be admoniſhed, and, if need be, compelled by

---

Britain, and Ireland, with whom he has correſponded for ſome years paſt, and whoſe letters to him he has inſerted in the appendix to his pamphlet. Theſe are *the higheſt living authorities* to which he alludes; and, relying ſolely on their aſſurances, he takes upon him to convince the Britiſh public, that there are no doctrines in the Romiſh Church dangerous to a Proteſtant ſtate. Theſe Biſhops applaud his zeal in the defence of their Church, and *flatter* him for his profound knowledge of its tenets.

* We ſhall prove that he is either radically ignorant of them, or that he means to miſrepreſent them.

† Among theſe we find Doctor Troy, Titular Archbiſhop of Dublin, whoſe works, which we ſhall quote, are a complete refutation of what he ſays in his letters to Sir J. C. Hippiſley, and of the encomiums which the honourable Baronet pronounces on the Popiſh doctrines.

ecclesiastical censures, that as they desire to be reputed Christians, so they will take an oath for the defence of the faith, that they will *honestly* endeavour to extirpate heretics." The general council of Constance requires, "All Archbishops, Bishops, and other persons chosen for this work, to admonish and require Kings and Emperors, Dukes, Princes, Earls, Barons, and by the apostolical authority to *command* them, to expel all heretics out of their kingdoms, provinces, cities, towns, castles, villages, territories, and other places, according to the canon of the Lateran council." Concil. Const. sess. 45 apud Bincum, to. 7, p. 1121. The 4th Lateran declares, "that if the temporal lord shall neglect to purge his territories of heretical filth, he shall be excommunicated by the metropolitan and his suffragans; and if he shall neglect to give satisfaction within a year, this shall be signified to the POPE, that he may, from henceforth, *pronounce his subjects absolved from their oaths of allegiance, and expose his territories to be enjoyed by Catholics,* who, *having exterminated the heretics,* shall possess them without contradiction*." Ibid, p. 148, 149. We think it right to observe, that both the councils of Constance and Basil† do consider this 4th Lateran among the councils which all the Popes must swear to maintain, to the least tittle, and to defend even to the shedding of blood; and that the council of Trent‡ not only hath declared it to be a general council, but also doth affirm one of its definitions to be, the voice of the whole Church; and therefore these three general councils do approve all that is cited from this council. The general council of Constance decrees, "that all heretics, all followers and defenders of them, or partakers with them, though they shine in the dignity of Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops, Kings, Queens, Dukes, or any other ecclesiastical or mundane title, shall be

* We beseech the reader to observe, that the Bishops, who are the Pope's sentinels in every state, are appointed to carry these decrees into effect; for which purpose they are bound by two oaths; one while priests, and another afterwards, when advanced to the prelacy.

† Corde et ore profiteor fidem, secundum traditionem octo conciliorum generalium, necnon Lateranensis, Lugdunensis, Viennensis, Constantiensis, generalium etiam conciliorum, et illam fidem, usque ad unam apicem immutilatam servare, et usque ad animam et sanguinem defensare et predicare. Concil. Const. sess. 39. Basil 37. Such is the oath which every Pope takes to preach and enforce these infernal doctrines.

‡ Per Lateranense Concilium Ecclesia statuit. sess. 14, c. 5.

pronounced excommunicate, every Sunday and holy-day; and that the Archbiſhops, Biſhops, and Inquiſitors, ſhall diligently enquire concerning them, of what dignity, ſtate, pre-eminence, degree, order, or condition ſoever they are; and if they ſhall be found guilty and informed, by their authority they ſhall proceed againſt them, by excommunication, ſuſpenſion, interdict, as alſo by deprivation of their dignities, offices, and benefices, eccleſiaſtical; and alſo of their ſecular dignities and honours; and by executing upon them any corporal puniſhments, with which heretics uſed to be puniſhed, according to the canonical ſanctions." Concil. Conſt. ſeſſ. 45, apud Bincum, to. vii, p. 1125. The Council of Bourges, approved by the General Council of Conſtance, declares, "that war may juſtly be waged againſt heretics, and that Princes and Chriſtian people may be nominated to fight againſt them." Append. ad Concil. Baſil, apud Bincum, tom. viii, p. 200. The 4th Lateran declares, "that they, who, under the badge of the Croſs, will exert themſelves to exterminate heretics, ſhall enjoy the ſame indulgence and holy privilege, which is granted to them who go in defence of the Holy Land, that is, a full remiſſion of their ſins, and a greater degree of happineſs than others can expect." Concil. Later. quartum tom. xi, p. 149. The third Lateran and the Council of Sienna decree the ſame.

As many ſovereign Princes were deprived of their crowns or their lives, or both, by the enforcement of theſe dreadful decrees, others were compelled by fear to adopt and execute them in their territories. It is therefore declared by the Conſtitutions of the Emperor Frederick II, that "the Pataroni, *and all other heretics*, ſhall be duly puniſhed by the ſecular judge; they ſhall take them away by *a damnable death*." Concil. tom. xi, p. 423, ibid, p. 619, 621, apud Bincum. By the ſame it is decreed, that "the ſame puniſhment ſhall be inflicted upon thoſe who cheriſh and defend them." Ibid.

"The ſons and nephews of heretics, or of their receivers, defenders, or favourers, muſt be admitted to no public offices, or benefices, eccleſiaſtical or ſecular, nor to ſucceed to the inheritance of their fathers." Conſtitu. Fred. II, Innocent IV, p. 608.

"For the extermination of heretics, we decree," ſaith Lewis the VIIth of France, "that being condemned, they ſhall be puniſhed with the animadverſion due unto them." So alſo doth the Canon Law, Decretal, l. 5, tit. 7, cap. 13. "The ſame puniſhment ſhall be inflicted on thoſe, who, having once abjured their hereſy, relapſe into it." Conſt. Fred. II, p. 620. "*If after their death they ſhall be found to have been heretics, their bodies ſhall be dug up, and their*

bones burnt." Concil. Alb. can. 52, p. 727. "The temporal lords shall, by the diocesan and the inquisitors, be compelled, by ecclesiastical censures, to dig up their bodies." Ibid, can 27, p. 728. According to the decrees of these councils, and of many of the same tenor, the bodies of Wickliffe, Fagius, and Bucer, were dug up, and burnt in the reign of Queen Mary. Henry IV, of England, having obtained the throne by the commission of treason and murder, was very obsequious to the clergy, whose sanction he considered as necessary to varnish over the enormity of his crimes, and to confirm his usurpation. Though early in life he had been a favourer of Wickliffe's doctrines, he at the instance of the ecclesiastics*, prevailed on the Parliament to pass a law, by which the Bishops were empowered to try and condemn heretics, in their respective dioceses, and by this law it is enacted, that "after the sentence pronounced against them, the Mayor, Sheriff, or other officers, who must be present at the execution, are required to take them into their custody, and burn them before the people in some eminent place." Concil. tom. xi, part 2, p. 2101, A. D. 1408. Great numbers were burnt under this infamous engine of Popish cruelty. It was repealed in the reign of Edward the VIth; but having been re-enacted in the reign of Queen Mary, great numbers were immolated under it. In Fox's Acts and Monuments the reader will find a minute account of the trials of all those who fell victims to Popish vengeance, from the time of its enactment, to the end of Mary's reign. By the 4th Lateran, heretics, their receivers, defenders, or favourers, are made subject to the following disabilities and privations: "They shall not be admitted to give testimony, as a witness, or to any public offices or councils, or to the election of those that belong to them†. They shall have no power to make a will, nor shall they succeed to any inheritance; no man shall be compelled to answer them in any suit, but they shall be compelled to answer others: if a heretic be a judge, his sentence shall be null and void, nor shall any cause come before him; if an advocate, he shall not be permitted to plead; if a clerk or notary, the instruments drawn by him shall be of no moment." Concil Later. quartum can. 3. Concil. tom. xi,

* Ever ready when they have it in their power to enforce the mandates of the Popes, and the decrees of the General Councils, which indeed they are sworn to do.

† Was it unreasonable, then, to deprive Papists of the elective franchise, under a Protestant state?

p. 149, 150: "If any Archbiſhop or Biſhop ſhall be negligent, or be remiſs in purging his dioceſe of heretical pravity, he muſt be depoſed from his epiſcopal office." This is decreed by the 4th Lateran, the Council of Conſtance, and the Canon Law. Decretal, l. 5, tit. 7, cap. 13.

By the 4th Lateran it is ordained, that "all Archbiſhops and Biſhops, by themſelves, or by ſome fit and honeſt perſons, twice, or at leaſt once a year, ſhall viſit their pariſhes, in which it is reported that heretics dwell, and ſhall compel three or more men of good character to ſwear, that if they know of any heretics they will inform their Biſhop of it." 4th Later. Con. aſſembled A. D. 1215, can. 3, Concil. tom. xi, part I, p. 152, apud Bincum. Pope Martin V, with the conſent and approbation of the General Council of Conſtance, commands all Archbiſhops, Biſhops, and Inquiſitors, to make a ſimilar inquiſition, and by the ſame means; "and if they find any perſons informed, or even ſuſpected, of being guilty of the crime of hereſy, they are to compel them, under the penalty of excommunication, ſuſpenſion, interdict, or confeſſion of the crime, or any more formidable puniſhment, canonical *or legal,* to take a corporal oath, upon the Evangeliſts, the reliques of the Saints, or a Crucifix, to anſwer to the queſtions which they ſhall aſk them." Concil. Conſt. ſeſſ. 45, tom. vii, p. 1121. "If any perſon whom they ſuſpect to be guilty of hereſy, will not undergo their canonical purgation, or by a damnable obſtinacy refuſes to ſwear, for the purpoſe of his purgation, he is to be condemned as a heretic." Concil. Later. quartum, can. 3. Concil. tom. xi, p. 152. Concil. Conſt. ſeſſ. 45, apud Bincum, tom. vii, p. 1121. The puniſhments, which by the Councils and Canons of the Church are inflicted on heretics, are the following, "excommunication, confiſcation of their goods, impriſonment, exile, death." Concil. Bitter. A. D. 1246, can. 2.

They muſt be excommunicated with all their favourers, every week, ſays the Council of Bezieres, A. D. 1233, can. 1, and A. D. 1246, can. 8, and the Council of Albycan, 19. This ſentence paſſes every year on them in the Bulla Cænæ.

By various general councils, "the names of the accuſers of heretics ſhall not be made public, either by word or ſign, becauſe this is the pleaſure of the apoſtolic ſee." Concil. tom. xi, apud Bincum, p. 689, 690.

And whereas in other countries, by the laws of nations, notorious criminals, infamous and perjured perſons, were not allowed to be admitted to give teſtimony againſt others, eſpecially in matters of life and death; all criminals, and infamous perſons, though partaking with them in their crimes,

may be admitted to accuse and testify against heretics. Ibid, p. 494, 690. It is insisted in various general councils, that their decrees are *infallible, and cannot err, because they are dictated by the Holy Ghost.* "Nec quisquam illud dicere presumat, quod aliquod generale concilium legitimè congregatum, errare possit, quia si hic pernicioſus error admitteretur, tota fides Catholica vacillaret, nec aliquid certè in Ecclesia haberemus, quia qua ratione errare potest unam, possint errare et reliqua concilia." Concil. Basil, apud Bincum, tom. viii, p. 128. "Nor let any person presume to say, that a general council, legitimately assembled, can err, because were this pernicious error allowed, the whole Catholic faith might fall to the ground, and there would not be any certainty in the Church; for should an error in one be admitted, the remainder of them may err." By the same, and many other councils, it is declared to be blasphemy and heresy to assert that a general council can err. "Blasphemia esset, si quis negaret Spiritum Sanctum dictare sententias, canones et decreta conciliorum." Ibid, p. 131. "It would be blasphemy in any person to assert, that the sentences, canons, and decrees, of the general councils were not dictated by the Holy Ghost*." Ibid. What gross blasphemy, what an insult to the Deity, to declare, that the infamous doctrines which we have described are inspired by him, when they are contrary to evangelical truth, repugnant to his moral and physical perfections, and are subversive of his attributes of wisdom, justice, and mercy, which are the main pillars of the divine administration! "Hæreticum illum fateri debetis, qui putat concilium generale in his, quæ ad fidum, seu bonos mores pertinent, posse errare†." Ibid, p. 135. Though councils join with Popes in the making of their canons and decrees, yet during the intervals of their sessions, by the whole church, the authentic exposition and execution of them are delegated exclusively to the Sovereign Pontiff. Resp. Synod. Basil, apud Bincum, tom. viii, p. 141. Decret. part I, dist. 17, cap. 4. Decret. p. II, caus. 23, qu. 5, cap. 43.

---

* We are surprised that the pious and learned Bishop of Durham, in his last charge to his clergy, did not state any of these doctrines as reasons why the Reformists separated from the Romish Church. He confines himself merely to six speculative errors, which though grossly superstitious, are in a great measure innoxious.

† "He should be reputed a heretic, who should believe that a general council can err, in any matter that concerns the holy faith, or the purity of morals." What a system of morals do these councils present!

Such are the infernal doctrines of the general councils of the Romiſh Church, which Sir J. C. Hippiſley endeavours to palliate, though it is evident that he has never read any of them*; and he deſires us, when conſidering them, "for a moment to diveſt ourſelves of our early prejudices, and the influence of our nurſery tales." We defy Sir J. C. Hippiſley, or any other perſon, to prove, that any reſpectable body of Roman Catholics ever renounced and condemned the general councils, which are very properly pronounced, by various acts of the Britiſh Parliament, to be *ſuperſtitious and idolatrous, impious, heretical, and damnable;* on the contrary, we ſhall prove, that ſome of the moſt eminent divines of the Romiſh Church, and ſome of its moſt zealous advocates, now living, inſiſt that they are infallible, and that all Papiſts muſt adhere implicitly to them.

Mr. Francis Plowden ſays, in his Caſe Stated, publiſhed in London, in the year 1791, "*the decrees of a general council*, in matters of faith and morality, when approved of by the Pope, and received by the Church, are abſolutely infallible, and not liable to deceit or error, and that *all Roman Catholics are obliged implicitly to adhere to them.*" In the ſame book he ſays, "If any one ſays, or pretends to inſinuate, that the modern Roman Catholics, who are the late object of the bounty of Parliament, differ in one iota from their anceſtors, he either deceives himſelf, or he wiſhes to deceive others. Semper eadem is more emphatically deſcriptive of our religion, than our juriſprudence." The Rev. Charles Plowden, his brother, and a Popiſh Prieſt, now officiating at Briſtol, goes much farther; for in a tract publiſhed by him in London, in the year 1790, and intitled, "Conſiderations on the Modern Opinion of the Fallibility of the Holy See," he inſiſts "on the infallibility of the Pope," and he endeavours to prove, that it is not dangerous to civil government, and that it is particularly advantageous to the Catholics of Great Britain†." He further aſſerts, that "it is as neceſſary for the conſtitution of the Church, and the preſervation of the faith, *as the infallibility of councils themſelves.*" The Rev. Doctor Troy, titular Archbiſhop of Dublin, ſays in his well known Paſtoral Letter, publiſhed in 1793, p. 72, "The Church is infallible in her doctrinal deciſions and canons, or points of faith and morals; and therefore the Catholics are

* We hope ſo for his own credit; for otherwiſe he could not make ſo light of them.

† Should they not come forward and vindicate themſelves from ſo foul an aſperſion?

obliged to adhere implicitly to such decrees and canons of the Church assembled in general council, and confirmed by the Pope, as rules of faith." "They are also obliged, in like manner, *to submit to similar decisions and decrees of the Pope,* when expressly or tacitly assented to, or not differed from, by the majority of Bishops, representing and governing the Church dispersed; on these points all Catholics are agreed, *as immutable articles of faith.*" In page 31 of the same he says, "It is a fundamental article of the Roman Catholic faith, that *the Pope, or Bishop of Rome, as successor of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, in that see, enjoys, by divine right, a spiritual and ecclesiastical supremacy, not only of honour and rank, but of real jurisdiction and authority, in the universal church**." Roman Catholics conceive this point as clearly as if established in the Scriptures, and by the constant tradition of the fathers in every age, as it is by the *express decision of their general councils, which they consider as infallible in points of doctrine.* In a note on this passage Doctor Troy enumerates many general councils, which he pronounces to be infallible, and among them he states the 4th Lateran, A. D. 1215, Constance, 1414, and Trent, 1545†; which contain all the infamous and unchristianlike doctrines which we have already set forth. Sir J. C. Hippisley‡, actuated by that ardent zeal which he uniformly displays to varnish over the dangerous tenets of the Romish Church, wrote letters to Italian, English, Scotch, and Irish Bishops, for information on this subject; and on their assurances alone he endeavours to convince the British public that they are as consonant to the Scriptures, and as well calculated to promote social order under a Protestant state, as those of the Established Church. The Baronet has inserted in his appendix letters on this subject from Doctor Milner, a Vicar Apostolic in England, from Doctor Maylan, titular Bishop of Cork, and from Doctor Troy, whom we have already mentioned.

---

* All this is in italics in the original.

† Doctor Troy, in a Pastoral Letter, published in Dublin, in 1798, and printed by P. Wogan, recommends this pastoral letter, as containing the duty of Christian citizens. In this he says, "as the religious principles of Roman Catholics being unchangeable, they are applicable to all times."

‡ We find that he has been zealously employed on this subject many years, for he tells us, in page 115, that he had a conference in the year 1794, relative to it, with Cardinals Zelada, and Antonelli, the secretary of state, and prefect of the Propaganda Fide.

The latter concludes a long letter to Sir John, which is inserted in the appendix of his pamphlet, with the following paragraph, after having applauded his zeal, and flattered him for his profound knowledge of the doctrines of the Romish Church. "I shall truly rejoice if this explanation shall have contributed to undeceive your friends in England, and to chase away those *bug-bears* from their apprehensions."

We conceive that Doctor Troy found no difficulty in convincing Sir John of the rectitude of Romish principles, his mind having been strongly pre-occupied in their favour; for he says, in page 11, somewhat in the style of Doctor Troy:

"Let us for a moment divest ourselves of our early prejudices, the influence of our nurses' tales, and of the orgies attendant on the annual commemoration of the Popish plot*. It is but fair to permit our fellow subjects, who hold communion with Rome, to speak for themselves. Let Rome answer for herself, and let us not precipitately condemn her for tenets which constitute no part of her doctrines, or even discipline."

We join issue with him on this point, and we cannot do better, to comply with his wishes, than by giving the opinion of his friend Doctor Troy, a most eminent divine of the Romish Church, by whose *pastoral instructions he has been so eminently illuminated,* and by which he has learned the great folly of enacting laws at the Revolution†, to guard the constitution against *bug-bears and nursery tales.* The Doctor, in pages 100 and 101 of his famous Pastoral Letter of 1793, much praised by Sir John, laments that gross misconceptions have been formed of his religion. "This gross ignorance is excusable in many Protestants and others, not in communion with the See of Rome. In general they are only acquainted with our religious tenets from the asserted superstition and terrors of Popery, repeated in the nursery, and re-echoed in chatechisms, calculated to excite prejudices against Catholics, rather than to inculcate the truths of religion. These prejudices are fostered by anniversary sermons, by reviews, diction-

* Let him recollect the orgies celebrated in many parts of Ireland in 1798, particularly on Vinegar-Hill, Wexford-bridge, and in the barn of Scullabogue, in which one hundred and eighty-four Protestants were burnt, and thirty-seven shot in front of it. These, and the dreadful massacre on the 23d of July, 1803, were produced by the same sanguinary principles, which occasioned so many religious butcheries in Queen Mary's reign. The streets of Dublin are patrolled during the night at this time, to prevent a recurrence of such scenes.

† A certain noble lord said, that those wise laws for guarding the constitution were enacted at a barbarous period, *the Revolution.*

aries, tours, travels, gazetteers, magazines, and other trifling publications, detailing the enormities of blood-thirsty Papists*, ridiculing the mysteries and ministers of the Catholic religion. There are many readers, but few reasoners in this age of boasted illumination and exaggerated knowledge." "We wish that Protestants and others may judge of our religious and civil principles by our catechisms, by our books of devotion and religious instruction, *by the Pastoral Letters of our Bishops*†, *by the dogmatical constitutions of our Popes, by the acts of our general councils, and by our uniform conduct*‡." Let the British public judge of the purity of their principles from the sketch which we have given of them, and of their uniform conduct from their cruel and sanguinary practices in Europe, Asia, and America, wherever they had obtained an ascendency, or a well grounded hope of acquiring it. They may truly say then,

"Quæ regio in terris nostri non plena laboris."

The horrid cold-blooded massacres which took place in Ireland in 1798, and 1803, prove that the infernal doctrines of the general councils§ are still in grim repose, and are ready to burst forth, with their wonted fury and malignity, on the *winking of authority* from their priests, who infuse them into the multitude. This cannot be a matter of astonishment, as human ingenuity, joined to the most diabolical malignity, could not devise a better system, than that which has been adopted by the Holy See, to maintain in full force, and to carry into practice, those dreadful doctrines. Every Popish priest is obliged to swear, in his canonical oath, at his ordination, "to receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and general councils, and particularly by the *holy council* of Trent‖; and to condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies which the church has condemned, rejected, and anathematized." He

---

* The events which have taken place since the year 1793, when this Pastoral was published, prove that the fears of Protestants from Popish principles are not *bug-bears* or *nursery tales.*

† His own pastoral letter is sufficient to put us on our guard against Popish tenets.

‡ Did the votaries of his church ever miss an opportunity of carrying into effect the intolerant and sanguinary doctrines of their general councils?

§ Doctor Troy says they are infallible, and that Catholics must implicitly adhere to them.

‖ Which sanctions and confirms the councils of Lateran and Constance, the doctrines of which have been described.

alſo promiſes " to acknowledge the Holy, Catholic, Apoſtolic Roman Church, for the mother and miſtreſs of all churches, and promiſes true obedience to the biſhop of Rome, ſucceſſor to St. Peter, prince of the apoſtles, and vicar of Chriſt." Doctor Troy, in his letter to Sir J. C. Hippiſley, Appendix iii, p. 24, confeſſes that ſuch an oath is taken by Popiſh prieſts; but he aſſerts, what is not founded in fact, that they do not take it till they are appointed to a benefice. But it follows, even from his own limited admiſſion, that every beneficed prieſt muſt be a traitor, if he adheres to this oath, and that he muſt be perjured ſhould he be loyal to a Proteſtant ſtate. A Popiſh biſhop takes an oath at his conſecration, in which there are the following paragraphs: " I will be faithful and obedient to St. Peter the apoſtle, and the holy Roman Church, and to our Lord the Pope, and his ſucceſſors, canonically entering." "The rights, honours, privileges, and authority of the holy Roman Church, and of our Lord the Pope, and his ſucceſſors aforeſaid, *I will be careful to preſerve, defend,* ENLARGE, *and promote.*" " All heretics, ſchiſmatics, and rebels againſt our ſaid Lord, and his ſucceſſors aforeſaid, I will to the utmoſt of my power perſecute and oppoſe." It has been contended, that the words *perſequar et impugnabo* mean no more than to proſecute heretics by argument and ratiocination; but we hope to convince the reader of the contrary. When Pope Paſchal II excommunicated the Emperor Henry IV, at the cloſe of the 11th century, he called upon Robert, Count of Flanders, to attack him in the following words:—Henricum caput hereticorum, et ejus fautores, pro viribus perſequaris & impugnas. Hoc tibi *et militibus tuis precipimus.* " You ſhall perſecute and impugn Henry the head of the heretics, and his favourers: we enjoin this to you and your ſoldiers*." Theſe mandatory words, addreſſed to ſoldiers, appear in many Papal bulls and epiſtles, ordering the extirpation of heretics, and the dethronement of princes. But if the words *perſequar et impugnabo* meant no more than to proſecute by argument, why addreſs it to ſoldiers, whoſe logic lies in their arms? Such is obviouſly the acceptation of *perſequor* in the Romiſh Church; and we ſhall find that it had the ſame among the Romans, when latinity was in its pureſt ſtate. Cicero, in his fourth oration againſt Cataline, uſes the word *perſequor* in the ſame ſenſe. Atque illo tempore, hujus avus Lentuli, clariſſimus vir, *armatus* Gracchum eſt *perſecutus:* Ille etiam grave tum vulnus accepit. " And at that time an illuſtrious perſon, the uncle of that Lentulus, at-

* Paſchal, 2 Ap. vii. Bin. tom. vii, p. 517.

tacked Gracchus with arms, and gave him a ſevere wound." Can we be ſurpriſed that Popiſh biſhops ſhould take an oath to perſecute heretics, when, as the Pope's ſentinels, it was their peculiar province, as preſcribed by the general councils? They were ordered to report to the Pope ſuch princes or governors as would not extirpate heretics, and they were finally to try and condemn them to be burnt.

Sir J. C. Hippiſley tells us, from page 76 to 84, on the authority of Dr. Troy, that the Pope, at the inſtance of the Iriſh titular biſhops, in the year 1791, ordered the before mentioned clauſe in the conſecration oath of Popiſh biſhops to be omitted. But what reliance can be placed on the aſſertion of perſons, who are bound by the fundamental principles of their religion to regard oaths as mere nullities when ſworn to heretics, or when they are in the ſmalleſt degree injurious to the intereſts of their Church? as we ſhall hereafter prove in the fulleſt manner.

The Catholic committee, conſiſting of the principal Popiſh inhabitants of the ſeveral pariſhes in Dublin, met at the Muſic-hall, Fiſhamble-ſtreet, the 23d of March 1792, and after a long debate, in which the *famous orator, John Keogh,* made a conſpicuous figure, they framed and publiſhed by their printer, Patrick Byrne*, a declaration of their civil and religious principles, under nine heads, which was ſigned by their two ſecretaries†, by every other perſon preſent, and by the *Rev. Dr. Troy,* and all the Popiſh clergy of Dublin. In this they renounced all the exceptionable tenets of their religion, which we have exhibited in their general councils, and the practice of which we ſhall afterwards in the fulleſt manner ſet forth. And yet all the abominable doctrines of their religion, which they had thus oſtentatiouſly renounced, exploded with deſtructive fury in the rebellion of 1798; and to aggravate their ſhame and their guilt, the multitude and their prieſts, a ſhort time previous to that dreadful event, ſwore oaths of allegiance in many parts of Ireland, at the foot of

---

* He was deeply concerned in the treaſonable conſpiracy which produced the rebellion of 1798; but, through the clemency of government, was only tranſported.

† John Sweetman and Richard M'Cormick. The former was conſidered as a perſon of the utmoſt probity, but yielding to the principles of his religion, which preſcribe treaſon to a Proteſtant ſtate, as a ſacred duty, he, in violation of his oath of allegiance, became a traitor, and was tranſported. M'Cormick, conſcious of his guilt, fled, and is now in France. Many members of that committee were hanged, tranſported, or fled.

their reſpective altars, before the civil magiſtrate. Subſequent events have fully evinced, and government obtained the moſt unequivocal proofs, that the Catholic committee, which acted ſo inſidiouſly, had at that time organized the rebellion of 1798. The ſame year that treaſonable aſſembly, the Catholic committee, publiſhed the opinions of ſome foreign Popiſh univerſities, on the tenets of the Romiſh Church, obtained by the Engliſh Roman Catholics in 1789, containing the moſt abominable falſehoods; and yet the Britiſh miniſter was gulled by that vile impoſture.

As the Catholic committee were endeavouring at that time, with the aid of a few democrats at Belfaſt, who were infected with French coſmopolitan principles, to ſeduce the northern Preſbyterians, and to attach them to their cauſe, they ſent, through their chairman, Edward Byrne, the ſaid declaration of their principles to Sinclare Kelburne, a Preſbyterian miniſter at Belfaſt, who read it to his congregation*. We ſtated, in page 347 of our 27th volume, that John Keogh, the orator, made ſome miſſions to the north in the year 1792, accompanied by ſome of his turbulent aſſociates, for the ſame purpoſe. After this we hope that the author will not attempt to miſlead the public, by vouching for the purity of Popiſh principles, by placing a reliance on the aſſurances or declarations of the Roman Catholic clergy; who, as well as the Pope, inculcated the extirpation of heretics and the nullity of oaths to a Proteſtant ſtate, during all the rebellions which, in the ſixteenth and ſeventeenth centuries, diſgraced and afflicted Ireland. Can it be a matter of aſtoniſhment, that the maſs of the Iriſh Papiſts are conſtantly prone to form treaſonable combinations, and to maſſacre ſuch of their fellow-ſubjects as they regard as heretics, when the Popiſh prieſts, as it were, alembicate the unſocial, intolerant, and ſanguinary doctrines of the general councils, and infuſe them into their flocks at the tender age of ſeven†? for at ſo early a period are they obliged to reſort to the confeſſion box. Thoſe, therefore, are egregiouſly miſtaken, who imagine that the principles of Popiſh prieſts and their flocks will be in the ſmalleſt degree meliorated, by educating the former at Maynooth College, inſtead of a foreign ſeminary‡.

---

* Muſgrave's Hiſt. Rebel. vol. i, p. 95, 96. This demagogue afterwards married his own ſervant, and died *inſane*, under the odium of public contempt.

† Children of twelve years were engaged in the cruſade againſt heretics in the rebellion of 1798. Muſgrave's Hiſt. vol. ii, p. 306.

‡ In the years 1798 and 1803 there were more dreadful ſcenes of outrage and turbulence in Maynooth and its vicinity than in any

We ſhall now lay before the Britiſh public ſome of the dreadful effects of thoſe general councils, expounded and enforced by the Popes, who are ſworn to do ſo. In the diſcharge of this duty they have conſtantly abſolved ſovereign princes from their coronation oaths, by which they were bound to protect their ſubjects; and they have compelled them to perſecute ſuch of them as they regarded as heretics. They have alſo releaſed from their oaths of allegiance the ſubjects of ſuch princes as would not implicitly ſubmit to the imperious dictates and pretenſions of the Holy See. In the eighth century Pope Gregory II abſolved the ſubjects of the Emperor Leo Iſauricus from their oaths of allegiance, in the dukedom of Rome, made them renounce their fealty to their liege ſovereign, and perſuaded them to acknowledge him as ſuch; and thus the title of the Pope to that territory was founded in treaſon and perjury. The Pope accuſed him of hereſy; and Signonius, a Popiſh hiſtorian, acknowledges, that the only crime he accuſed him of was, his prohibiting the adoration of images; "eo uno crimine, quod *imaginibus* ſe inimicum probuer at," ſays Signonius, "de regno Italiæ." Cardinal Baronius, the Pope's own hiſtorian, ſays, applauding this infamous breach of duty, "he left a worthy example to poſterity, that heretical princes ſhould not be ſuffered to reign in the church of Chriſt, if, being warned, they were found pertinacious*." Pope Gregory V excommunicated Robert, King of France, in the year 998; and the ſentence had ſuch an effect on his ſubjects, that they would not approach him, nor handle any thing that had been contaminated by his touch, till it was purified by paſſing it through fire. In the eleventh century Gregory VII wrote thus to King Philip of France; "either King Philip, rejecting the filthy merchandize of *ſymoniacal hereſy*, will permit fit perſons to be choſen into the government of the Church, or the French will refuſe to obey him any longer, being ſmitten with the ſword of a general anathema†." The only hereſy of which he could accuſe him was, his claiming the inveſtiture of biſhopricks, which the Pope wiſhed to arrogate to himſelf excluſively; and this he pronounced to be ſufficient to juſtify his ſubjects in withdrawing their allegiance from their lawful

---

other part of Ireland; and many ſtudents of that college were deeply concerned in the rebellion of 1798, for which they were expelled.

* An. 730, 40.

† Greg. VII, Epiſt. l. 1, ep. 35. Concil. tom. 10, p. 34, apud Bincum.

prince. In the twelfth century, to give the better colour to the depoſition of the Emperors Henry IV and Henry V, it was firſt voted, in a council held at the Lateran, A.D. 1102*, *That it was hereſy to aſſert the right of laymen to inveſt into eccleſiaſtical preferments.* This decree was renewed in a council held at Vienna, A. D. 1112, and by another held at the Lateran, A.D. 1116†; and, in purſuance of theſe decrees, the ſaid Emperors were depoſed. The ſubjects of Henry IV roſe in rebellion againſt him, in conſequence of Gregory the VIIth's excommunication; and that dreadful engine of ſuperſtitious tyranny had ſuch an influence, as to extinguiſh reaſon and natural affection in the Empreſs Agnes, his mother, the Ducheſs Beatrix, his aunt, and the Counteſs Matilda, his couſin-german; for they not only contributed money, but levied troops to ſecond the Pope's haughty pretenſions. The ſubjects of King John of England revolted againſt him in conſequence of a ſentence of excommunication, pronounced by Pope Innocent III; and he was obliged to reſign his crown to that haughty prelate, and to become his vaſſal. In the year 1215, Raymond, Count of Thouloufe, was deprived of his territories by a ſentence of excommunication, becauſe he would not perſecute part of his ſubjects, called the Albigenſes and Waldenſes‡. In the year 1210, the citizens of Thouloufe were excommunicated becauſe they neglected to extirpate heretics§.

We paſs over the numerous damnatory bulls for the excommunication and dethronement of ſovereign princes, which iſſued from the Papal chancery in 1227, 1281, 1307, 1326, 1425, and 1512, down to the Papal murders of Henry III and IV of France, in order to notice more particularly thoſe aſſaſſinating edicts which have been aimed at our own Proteſtant ſovereigns.

In the year 1538 Pope Paul III iſſued a denunciation againſt Henry VIII of England, in which he declared, that if he did not ſubmit and renounce his errors in ninety-one days, he ſhould ſtand excommunicated; and, moreover, he abſolved his ſubjects from their oaths of fealty and allegiance to him, commanding them, under the penalty of excommunication, not to obey him, or to acknowledge him.

---

* Bin. tom. 7, p. 533. † Ibid, p. 554.

‡ Concil. tom. xi, p. 35, apud Bincum. Sir J. C. Hippiſley, in page 62, ſays, that auricular confeſſion and excommunication have, *prima facie*, the good of ſociety for their object. We ſhall refer our readers to page 506 of our 22d volume, for the dangerous influence of the former, and the ruinous effects of the latter in Ireland.

§ Concil. tom. xi, p. 35.

Bulls of excommunication were publiſhed againſt Queen Elizabeth by the following Popes: By Pius V in 1569, by Gregory XIII in 1580, by Sixtus V in 1587, and by Clement VIII in 1600. By the firſt, "all her ſubjects are declared abſolved from their oaths of allegiance, and any other duty; and if they afterwards return to their obedience are puniſhed by anathema."

Sir J. C. Hippiſley is groſsly ignorant of the effects of the bull of Pius V on the Queen's Popiſh ſubjects, or he wiſhes to *conceal* them from the Britiſh public. In page 48 he ſays,

"Of this bull of Pius V, it is ſufficient to remark, that it never was received, or conſidered as binding on the conſciences or conduct of the Queen's Catholic ſubjects. It was founded on *no principle of doctrine, or admiſſible diſcipline**. *It was merely the aſſumption of an intemperate, misjudging individual*†, acted upon by the animoſity of the Queen's inveterate enemy, the court of Spain. The conſequences were no other than could be reaſonably expected: none but a frenzied fanatic could for a moment liſten to it. The Queen's Catholic ſubjects defended her perſon and throne, and the thunders of the Vatican were ſpent in air. I will further obſerve on this bull of Pius V, that it is aſſerted by the learned gentleman (Dr. Duigenan) to have been confirmed by his ſucceſſor, Gregory XIII. The contrary is the fact, inaſmuch as that Pope expreſsly declared it *was not binding on the Engliſh Catholics.*"

It is juſtly obſerved, both by Camden and Rapin, that no perſon was moleſted, on account of religion, during the firſt eleven years of her reign, and not until the bull of Pope Pius V induced her ſubjects to rebel; and it produced, ſoon after its publication, ſo many treaſonable conſpiracies againſt the ſtate, and ſo many aſſaſſination plots againſt the life of the Queen, which are minutely deſcribed by Camden and Speed, that the government was obliged, in its own defence, to enact ſevere penal laws againſt Papiſts, and to baniſh their prieſts‡. Not only numbers of the lower claſs, but ſome of the chief nobility, complied with its mandates. When, in obedience to it, the Earls of Northumberland and Weſtmoreland, with their adherents, were in open rebellion, that Pope

---

* We have fully proved the contrary in the ſketch which we have given of the leading doctrines contained in the general councils.

† Theſe principles and practices were uniformly adopted and carried into practice by the Popes, from the beginning of the eighth to the middle of the ſeventeenth century.

‡ Fifty of them were hanged, and fifty-five were baniſhed. Camden, p. 649. Rapin, note in page 156 of folio edition; great numbers fled.

wrote a letter to them, exhorting them to perſevere in their pious cruſade, which letter contains the following blaſphemous paragraphs: "The Lord Jeſus Chriſt hath by you (men to us dear and eminent, as well by the ſtudy of Catholic piety as by nobleneſs of birth) determined, peradventure, to renew and confirm the antient union of the Roman Church with that kingdom; and therefore hath infuſed into you that mind moſt worthy of the zeal of your Catholic faith, that you ſhould attempt to bring back that kingdom (delivered from the moſt vile ſervitude of a woman's luſt) to the antient obedience of this holy Roman See." "But if, in aſſerting the Catholic faith and authority of this Holy See, you ſhould ſuffer death, and your blood be ſpilt, it would be much better for the confeſſion of God, to fly by the compendium of a glorious death to eternal life, than living baſely and ignominiouſly to ſerve the luſt of an impious woman with the loſs of your ſouls*." The Earl of Weſtmoreland died a miſerable exile, in the year 1584; and in the year 1572, the Duke of Norfolk and the Earl of Northumberland were executed for their treaſon and rebellion againſt the Queen: Gregory XIII, inſtead of *declaring that it was not binding on the Catholics, as moſt untruly ſtated by Sir J. C. Hippiſley,* acknowledged its validity, by granting them a diſpenſation from ſtrictly adhering to it. The Engliſh Papiſts conſidered themſelves as conſcientiouſly bound to conform to it, but as by doing ſo they would have incurred the guilt of high treaſon, they ſent two prieſts, Fathers Robert Parſons and Edmund Campion, to Gregory XIII for a diſpenſation from it; and he granted it only till they were powerful enough to riſe and rebel againſt her†. It is ſurpriſing that an incident related by *all* the Engliſh hiſtorians, from Camden and Speed to Smollet and Hume, ſhould have eſcaped Sir John's notice. One Hart, a prieſt, who, with the ſaid Campion, was convicted of high treaſon, made the following declaration the laſt day of December 1580:

"The bull of Pius V (for ſo much as it is againſt the Queen) *is holden among the Engliſh Catholics for a lawful ſentence, and a ſufficient diſcharge of her ſubjects fidelity, and ſo remaineth in force;* but in ſome points, touching the ſubjects,

* This is the tenth letter of the fourth book of the epiſtles of the ſaid Pope, publiſhed at Antwerp, ex officina Platiniana, by Francis Gobou, in 1640.

† Cardinal Bellarmin ſays, "we do not extirpate heretics when they are more powerful than us." *Hæreticos non eſſe bello petendos, quando ſunt fortiores nobis.*

it is altered by the present Pope. For in that bull all her subjects are commanded not to obey her; and she *being excommunicated and deposed,* all that do obey her are likewise innodate and accursed, which point is perilous to Catholics; for if they obey her, they are in the Pope's curse, and if they disobey her, they are in the Queen's danger; therefore the present Pope, to relieve them, hath altered that part of the bull, and dispensed with them to obey and serve her without peril of excommunication*."

To the irrefragable proofs which we have already adduced, that Gregory XIII did NOT *declare that the bull of Pope Pius V was not binding on the English Catholics,* we shall add, that the former issued a bull on the 13th of May, 1580, directed "*to all and singular archbishops and other prelates, princes, counts, barons, clergy, nobles, and people of the kingdom of Ireland;* and granted to all the Irish who would join the rebellion of the Fitzgeralds of Desmond, and fight against Queen Elizabeth, plenary pardon, and remission of their sins." This bull kindled a dreadful rebellion in Ireland, which desolated the greater part of that island.

We shall now return to state some of the bulls and epistles issued against Protestant sovereigns by the Roman Pontiffs. In 1606, and the year following, Pope Paul V directed two briefs to the Catholics of England, forbidding them to take the oath of allegiance, made by King James in Parliament, shortly after the discovery of the gunpowder plot.

Some doubts having arisen, whether the former brief conveyed the Pope's real sentiments, he thought fit to confirm it by another, dated September 22, 1607; in which, after having expressed very great concern at their doubts, he then addresses them: "*Ye, who in order to obey this Holy See, piously and generously set at nought wealth, fortune, dignity, liberty, nay even life itself*—we could not have suspected that ye would have questioned the fidelity of our apostolical letters, under this pretext, to exempt yourselves from our mandates. But we know the subtlety and fraud of *the enemy of human salvation*†, and attribute this opposition rather to it than to your will." Hibernia Dominicana, p. 615.

The persons who attempted to proclaim James I, in the principal towns in Ireland, on the death of Elizabeth, were furiously assaulted by Popish mobs, headed by their priests,

---

* Gibson's Collectanea, vol. iii, tit. 13, p. 152.

† He thus stigmatizes James I for maintaining the independence of his kingdom against the inordinate ambition of the Pope.

and narrowly escaped assassination. The Popish multitude seized the churches, posted guards, and had mass said in them. The only reason assigned by them for these treasonable practices was, that the King was not a Papist*. Notwithstanding these flagrant attempts of the Pope to seduce the subjects of James I from their allegiance, and of his votaries to rebel against him, Sir J. C. Hippisley, in page 119, would persuade us, that he was so far reconciled to him, that he "*felt no difficulty in corresponding with this dreadful pontiff, nor in acknowledging him as the first Christian bishop in rank and dignity, nor in styling him the Patriarch of the West.*"

What opinion could James I have of his Popish subjects, after the gunpowder plot was discovered, and after the treasonable conspiracy of Tyrone and Tyrconnel in Ireland; though he had pardoned them for being leaders in former rebellions, and had restored them to their honours and estates? We learn this from the following answer, which he gave to the agents of the Popish party in Ireland, who went to England to remonstrate against the proceedings of Parliament. "You," said the King, "that have a contrary religion, must not look to be the only law makers; you that are but *half subjects* should have but *half privileges*; you that have an eye to me but one way, and to the Pope another way; the Pope is your father *in spiritualibus*, and I *in temporalibus* only; and so you have your bodies torn one way and your souls drawn another: you that send your children *to seminaries of treason*, strive henceforth to become true subjects, that you may have *cor unum, et viam unam*, and then I shall respect you all alike; but your Irish priests teach you such grounds of doctrines, as you cannot follow them with a safe conscience, but you must cast off your loyalty to your king." Yet Sir J. C. Hippisley observes, in page 73,

"I cannot but look with cautious anxiety to the decrees and definitions of general councils, in matters of *doctrine at least*; but I will take care not to confound *the discipline* with the doctrinal canons of those councils, an error from which has originated much of the obloquy and imputation which we have heard, in the course of this debate, so profusely cast on those in communion with the See of Rome."

We should be glad to know what he means, for he makes a distinction without a difference. The canons prescribe, as a religious duty, the dethronement of heretical princes, the nul-

* Moryson, p. 291.

lity of oaths to them, and the extirpation of heretics; and we presume he means by the discipline the enforcement of them by the Popes.

Urban VIII published a brief, dated May 30, 1626, exhorting the English Catholics to lose their lives rather than be drawn to take that *noxious and unlawful oath of English fidelity* (uniformly condemned by his predecessors); *the object of which is, not only that their faith to the king should be secured, but that the sacred sceptre of the universal Church should be wrested from the vicars of Almighty God.* While the dreadful rebellion, which broke out in Ireland in 1641, continued to rage with destructive fury, the same Pope, by a bull, dated the 25th of May, 1643, granted plenary indulgence and a full remission of their sins, to such Roman Catholics as should join in it. It may probably be said by the advocates of Popery, that the Roman Pontiff, in his present state of depression, can no longer be formidable. But it should be recollected, that the terror with which he inspired Protestant states did not arise from the greatness of his armaments, but from the doctrines of his church, which his clergy are bound by oath to infuse into the subjects of every government; by which their allegiance is estranged from their liege sovereign, and transferred to a foreign prince*; and of its woeful effects we have given abundant proofs. Mr. Locke, therefore, in his Essay on Toleration, observes, "that church can have no right to be tolerated by the magistrate, which is constituted on such a bottom, that all those who enter into it do thereby, ipso facto, *deliver themselves up to the protection and service of a foreign prince.* For by this means the magistrate would give way to the settling of a foreign jurisdiction in his own country, *and suffer his own people to be listed, as it were, for soldiers against his own country.*"

The following incident unquestionably proves, that the doctrines of the Romish Church will remain unaltered, however degraded its sovereign Pontiff may be. In the year 1798 Pope Pius VI was driven from Rome by the French, who plundered it with merciless fury. As it was generally believed that the papacy would be overturned, Doctor Troy, to assure his flock of the contrary, published a pastoral instruction, addressed to them, in which, after inveighing against the tyranny, the cruelty, the rapacity, and infidelity of the

* Buonaparte now commands it, at least in Ireland; whose Popish inhabitants, it is well known, are much attached to him through the Pope, who is his vassal.

French*, he obſerves, "By forcing the ſupreme paſtor from his reſidence, and degrading him as much as in their power, they vainly expect that the diſperſion of the flock muſt follow; but it is not in the power of human malice *to deſtroy the work of God.* The gates of hell can never prevail againſt the Church, built on a ſolid and immoveable rock. The promiſes of her Divine founder ſhall for ever ſecure her againſt every attack; and the ſucceſſors of St. Peter will continue to the end of time to exerciſe the powers communicated to that firſt Biſhop of Rome by Jeſus Chriſt himſelf."—"Wherefore, whether our holy Father, Pius VI, and his ſucceſſors, reſide in the Vatican palace, or elſewhere in a cottage; whether at liberty or in chains; whether inveſted with the temporal ſovereignty of Rome†, or maintained with the arms of the faithful, *their ſupreme ſpiritual authority will remain unchanged and unaltered.*"

In a future number we ſhall enter into a more minute conſideration of the obſervations contained in Sir J. C. Hippiſley's pamphlet; not becauſe the tract is, in itſelf, worthy of ſuch lengthened notice, but becauſe it involves principles and doctrines, which are enforced with ſyſtematic perſeverance, and which, if generally received and adopted, would, at no very remote period, place this country in a ſituation the ſame as that in which it ſtood immediately previous to the year 1688, by bringing both the principles and practice of the *reformation* and *revolution* into diſgrace and diſrepute.

[*To be continued.*]

Three Comedies, tranſlated from the Spaniſh. Pp. 361. 8vo. 7s 6d. Hatchard. 1807.

THE judicious tranſlator of theſe comedies juſtly obſerves, that, "while the talents of ſome of our writers who hold the higheſt rank, with reſpect both to learning and genius, have been employed in tranſlating the dramatic poets of the

---

* It is well worth obſerving, that though the French ſhewed the moſt decided enmity to the Popiſh Church wherever they went, by degrading and finally by putting to death their chief paſtor, and by overturning its religious eſtabliſhments, the Iriſh Papiſts have continued their attachment to them, from the year 1793 to the preſent time; and the multitude, headed by their prieſts, joined them when they landed at Killala in 1798.

† Which was obtained by encouraging its inhabitants to rebel againſt their liege ſovereign, in violation of their oaths of allegiance.

ancients, and while the productions of the modern French and German ſtages crowd upon us, on all ſides, in Engliſh dreſſes, of a texture not very diſproportionate to the comparative merits of the originals; it appears extraordinary that the Spaniſh theatre has excited ſo little curioſity among us; and that, though the names of Lope de Vega, Calderon, and a few others, have long been univerſally known, ſcarcely any attempt has been hitherto *avowedly* made to introduce their works to the acquaintance of the Britiſh public." Such a circumſtance would indeed be inexplicable, were it not that moſt of thoſe perſons, capable of ſuch an undertaking, finding the rich luxuriance of the Spaniſh drama, have thought it more adviſable to aſſume the merit of *original* authors, than that of tranſlators. It is from this motive alone that we can account for the guarded ſilence of ſuch writers, and the general ignorance of the public with reſpect to the dramatical effuſions of the Spaniſh muſe. This diſingenuous artifice, however, of our dramatic writers, we are convinced, has been of very conſiderable diſadvantage, not only to Engliſh literature, but to the political intereſts of our country, and of the whole civilized world, as it has been the means of keeping the Engliſh nation groſsly ignorant of the real character and diſpoſition of the people of that country, with which, conſidering our long rivality with France, it was eſſential both to the honour and intereſt of Engliſhmen to be particularly and minutely acquainted. Had we been perfectly informed of the genius and *indole* of the Spaniards, and applied, in a proper manner, our confeſſedly ſuperior knowledge of the human mind to cultivate a more unreſtrained intercourſe and more confidential communication between the two countries, we might have, perhaps, ere this time, either aſſuaged the venom, or cruſhed the heads of the hydra ſuperſtition, which ſtill deſolates the world. There is nothing, indeed, but mutual ignorance of each other that occaſions Spain and England to be now at war; and we ſpeak the language of obſervation and experience, when we aſſert, that had theſe two nations better underſtood each other's real wiſhes, Spain would not now have been the humble vaſſal and auxiliary of the tyrant of the human race; ſhe would either have maintained a dignified neutrality, or lent an efficient force to ſet a juſt bound to the common deſpoilers, who are, in general, greatly inferior, either as ſoldiers or ſailors, to the Spaniards. Unhappily, however, the Spaniards "knew us not," and we have been as far from knowing them, or taking the proper means of making ourſelves known to them, and hence they have been obliged to join in

arms with the people they moſt deteſt againſt thoſe they moſt reſpect, and even revere. It is thus that Buonaparte has availed himſelf of their ignorance, to ſet their heads and hearts at variance, by means of his artful miſrepreſentations; and it is thus that ignorance and ſuperſtition, more groſs as they are ſurrounded with more intelligence than in the days of Gothic or Vandal barbariſm, now nerve the arm of the deſpot of France.

In this view we cannot but regret the general ignorance of Spaniſh literature, and conſequently of Spaniſh manners, in Britain, as being unqueſtionably the cauſe of very ſerious political and moral evils, in ſuffering a meritorious people to become involuntary aſſiſtants in Buonaparte's horrid project of extirpating liberty, juſtice, and true religion from the world. In a commercial view it has been no leſs injurious; for not only the books, but every other ſpecies of manufacture of a heretical country muſt be *chriſtianized*, according to their opinions, before they are proper for the uſe of good Catholic Chriſtians. It is true, ignorance only could occaſion ſuch notions; but ſuch ignorance is not to be removed by mere exclamations againſt it, no more than any abſtruſe ſcience is to be taught by pompous eulogiums of it; on the contrary, it will require time, aſſiduity, addreſs, and extenſive knowledge of the paſſions and humours of men, to overcome it effectually. If, indeed, this ignorance now evidently operates to our diſadvantage, and that it does cannot be reaſonably doubted, we have none but ourſelves to blame; for we have neither exerciſed thoſe powers with which we are abundantly gifted, or fulfilled our duty in carefully diſſeminating that knowledge and thoſe truths, with regard to religion, which have raiſed us ſo far above all ſurrounding nations, that even our virtues expoſe us to the virulence of the enemy. A certain portion of the ſpirit of proſelytiſm, as well as nationality, will always be favourable to virtue and political independence, and it is not without regret we obſerve, that very little of the former has ſufficed Engliſhmen, at leaſt the Proteſtant part of them, theſe laſt fifty years.

But independent of theſe conſiderations, however important they may be, Spain is a country which, after Italy, merits the firſt attention in the literary annals of Europe. The country in which Grecian, Roman, Arabic, and Caſtilian literature have all obtained very reſpectable diſtinctions in the temple of fame, cannot ſurely be longer indifferent or unintereſting to Engliſhmen, who, taken in general, are perhaps the moſt omniloquent of any people on earth. In a country where veſtiges of Grecian taſte, Roman ſtrength, Gothic barbariſm, and

Mooriſh pomp, ſtill remain; where almoſt every river, plain, village, or hamlet, has its claſſic traditions, its heroes, philoſophers, and poets, neither the painter, poet, nor hiſtorian, can be at a loſs for intereſting ſubjects in their reſpective purſuits; and he who wiſhes to have a profound knowledge of human nature will find few other countries where it can be contemplated in ſuch diverſe points of view. If the literature of Spain has actually ſuſtained any decadence, or rather ſtagnation, its former ſuperiority is a ſufficient inducement to inveſtigate the cauſes, as the country once civilized, and fallen into decay, is much more intereſting than the ſavage wilds which never were "the buſy haunts of men." Egypt and Greece, formerly the theatres of arts and ſciences, and the ſites of populous cities, always have been, and always will be, objects much more worthy of deep ſtudy and contemplation than the deſert waſtes of Arabia or Africa. For the ſame reaſon, the political, civil, and literary hiſtory of Spain, whatever may be its actual condition, will always be more attracting and inſtructive than that of Ruſſia, or any other infant nation. For theſe and many other reaſons, we notice with pleaſure any work calculated to make the dramatic works of the Spaniſh poets, which have always ſome genuine traits of the manners, cuſtoms, and genius of the people, more familiar to the Britiſh public. The tranſlator, therefore, who makes the firſt attempt, even ſhould he fail, as may be in ſome meaſure expected, of complete ſucceſs, deſerves nevertheleſs the thanks of literary men, and the gratitude of his country. We muſt firſt, however, notice an obſervation in the tranſlator's preface, to the propriety and truth of which we moſt cordially ſubſcribe.

"The Spaniſh drama," ſays he, "in many eſſential reſpects, reflects great honour on its country. During the ſeventeenth century, while our own ſtage exhibited ſcenes of the moſt infamous profligacy, that of Spain could boaſt a purity, which has ſeldom been preſerved on any other. In many volumes of the works of her dramatic writers of that period, ſcarcely an inſtance occurs of paſſages offenſive to the ſtricteſt delicacy; and it appears to have been their object to render vice not merely odious, but diſguſting, no leſs than it is that of our modern ſentimental neighbours, and, by their example, of too many amongſt ourſelves, to adorn it with the deluſive colours of exalted virtue."

The ſame regard to decorum and delicacy is ſtill maintained in all their theatrical repreſentations; but there is ſtill too little ſhame and horror attached to the commiſſion of murder in that country, againſt which their laws are far from being ſufficiently rigid. Of the nature and object of this tranſlation let the author ſpeak.

"It may be proper to add," he obſerves, "that the tranſlation of theſe plays is by no means a faithful one. It is not, indeed, very practicable to tranſlate any comedies literally without loſing all that air of natural and eaſy converſation, which alone can render them agreeable; but the difficulty is much increaſed when verſe is to be converted into proſe. Spaniſh plays are written in various metres: the more familiar parts in lines of ſeven or eight ſyllables, of which, throughout a whole ſcene, the terminating vowels of every alternate line agree with each other, no rhyme being preſerved between the conſonants; but when the ſubject riſes, this is exchanged for the heroic verſe of ten or eleven ſyllables, with perfect rhymes; and occaſionally a ſort of irregular ode is introduced which ſuits the harmony and dignity of the Spaniſh language, but would have a ſtrange effect in any other Italian [and Portugueſe] only excepted. When two lovers meet, they generally grow metaphyſical, and carry on their diſcourſe in alternate ſonnets; which thoſe muſt have quick wits who underſtand, and which certainly none but very extraordinary geniuſes could compoſe extempore. Don John and Donna Beatrice have a conference of this kind in the ſecond act of *La Dama Duende*, with which the tranſlator confeſſes having taken great liberties."

We are fully aware of the difficulty of tranſlating theſe comedies faithfully; but as no attempt has been made to adapt them to the Engliſh ſtage, we know no reaſon why any very great liberties ſhould have been taken in only "naturalizing them ſo far, as that their foreign idiom ſhould not prepoſſeſs the reader againſt them as aliens." This, certainly, was the proper object to turn them into an Engliſh idiom, but not to omit or pervert their peculiarities, which tend to unfold to the Engliſh reader the true genius of that people, and the ſtyle and ſpirit of their literature. Had the tranſlator, indeed, deſigned theſe three comedies for repreſentation before an Engliſh audience, he might then have taken liberties with the language of his author in adapting it to public taſte; but as they are only deſtined for the cloſet, or drawing-room, as much of he manner, ſpirit, and ſentiment, as poſſible ſhould have been retained. We ſhall not, however, have occaſion often to diſpute with the tranſlator for the liberties which he has taken; but he ſhould have confeſſed his inability to do juſtice to the originals, rather than to have endeavoured to make ſuch of his readers as are unacquainted with Spaniſh, believe that he had only exerciſed good taſte and ſound judgment.

The comedies here tranſlated are, "The Fairy Lady," from *La Dama Duende*, which might be more properly rendered "The Inviſible Lady," as there is, perhaps, no other country in Europe where the belief in the exiſtence of fairies is leſs common than in Spain; "Keep your Own Secret," from *Nadie*

ſie ſu Secreto, both by Don Peter Calderon of La Barca; and "One Fool makes Many," from *Un Bobo hace Ciento*, (one fool makes a hundred) by Don Anthony de Solis. The plan of the firſt of theſe pieces, The Fairy, or (as we ſhould prefer it) The Inviſible Lady, by Calderon, conſiſts of the following circumſtances: Two brothers, who are violently in love with one woman, have charge of their ſiſter, a gay, handſome young widow, whom they keep as their ſtate priſoner, never ſuffering her to go out to viſit, or to hold any communication with the male part of the world (for ſuch was, and, in a more relaxed degree, ſtill is the Spaniſh cuſtom of keeping young unmarried women). This fair priſoner, who is the inviſible lady, having ſtolen one evening from her cell to ſee illuminations and a feaſt, accidentally meets with her brothers' moſt particular friend, who is coming on a viſit to Madrid, and to her brothers' houſe, at the moment ſhe was attempting to eſcape detection by one of her rigid guardians. She implored the ſtranger in the ſtreet (of Madrid) to protect her, and to prevent the watchful brother from following her, which he did, and a fight is the conſequence, which was fortunately ſtopped by the timely arrival of the other brother, who reconciles the two antagoniſts, and takes them to his houſe. Meantime the inviſible lady arrives in her apartments undiſcovered, and is viſited by her friend, the lady whom both her brothers adore. The ſtrange cavalier, however, had made ſuch an impreſſion on her heart as was not eaſily to be overcome, and nearly the whole of this play of three acts, including the period of three days, is occupied with the ingenious ſtratagems of this impriſoned widow, to convey letters by means of a hidden door into the cavalier's apartment. The correſpondence is at length diſcovered by one of her brothers, and after another bloodleſs battle, the piece ends in the Fairy Lady's marriage with the cavalier, the only man in the world whom her brothers would have preferred for her huſband. The incidents are well choſen, and not without intereſt; the *gracioſo*'s wit, or rather humour, is natural and lively, and there appears no good reaſon why this piece ſhould not be adopted on ſome of our theatres, except that, in the preſent degraded ſtate of dramatic writing, no *gentleman* would proſtitute his pen to be ranked among the illiterate witleſs play-wrights of modern times.

The next comedy is alſo by Calderon, entitled, "Keep your own Secret," or Truſt your Secret to Nobody. The action is laid in Parma, and the actors the Prince of Parma, his ſecretary, and a ſervant, with two court nobles and a lady, with whom the ſecretary is deſperately in love. The prince's ſecretary

having at length ſucceeded in gaining the attachment of his miſtreſs (who has alſo made an impreſſion on the heart of the prince), confides this ſecret in confidence to his friend, who tells it all to the prince; the latter being enamoured of the ſame lady, is jealous of his ſecretary, and although he is determined to allow their marriage, he thinks proper to amuſe himſelf, and try their mutual fidelity by various ſtratagems calculated to haraſs and diſappoint them: at length, finding their love mutual and unchangeable, he magnanimouſly ordered their marriage, and conquered his own affection. In this comedy the tranſlator has certainly taken "great liberties," and has omitted many admirable paſſages, replete with enthuſiaſm indeed, but alſo abounding in ſome juſt ſentiments and ſalutary truths. We can perceive no other reaſon that the tranſlator had for omitting nearly twenty lines in the opening ſpeech of this comedy, except that they are ſomewhat difficult to tranſlate: but it was a duty that he owed his Engliſh readers, to make them a little acquainted with the enthuſiaſm and ardour with which lovers expreſs themſelves in Spaniſh. Many of the prince's ſentiments, indeed, are very inadequately done into Engliſh, and the ſtyle is often too familiar for a prince, and much inferior to the original. The prince, ſpeaking of his ſecretary's abſence of mind, and inattention to buſineſs, is here made to ſay to the confidant of both, "But for this little while paſt, I know not what the *devil* has ailed him: he has paid no attention to the duties of his office." The original runs thus:

"De unos dias á eſta parte,
no ſé que trata, ó que tiene,
que ni á mi ſervicio acude,
ni deſpacha mis papeles."

"But, for ſome days, I know not from what cauſe, he has not appeared in my ſervice, nor executed my diſpatches." On the other hand, we acknowledge that the tranſlator has given a very good effect to ſome paſſages, particularly in the prince's anſwer to Don Arias's queſtion, why he ſhould have fallen ſo ſuddenly in love. *Preguntas bien, aunque ignorantemente* (thou inquireſt well, although ignorantly) is here rendered, "that is a queſtion which ſounds like a very wiſe one, and yet it ſhews but little knowledge of human nature." Upon the whole, if we object to the tranſlation of this truly moral comedy, it is chiefly becauſe the tranſlator has ground down the characters too much to the ſtandard of Engliſh ideas, and forces upon us the ſuſpicion, that his tranſlation has been originally deſigned for repreſentation, but owing either to managerial ignorance, or partiality, has, like the late Mr. Tobin's

Honey Moon, which is almoſt entirely copied from the Spaniſh, been *rejected*, or, what is worſe, *neglected*. For cloſet comedies, we would have a faithful portrait of the Spaniſh drawn by themſelves, in which their own ſtyle, manner, ſpirit, and ſentiments, ſhould only appear; in ſhort, every thing ſhould be purely Spaniſh, except the idiom, which may be rendered into pure Engliſh without much violence to the original. It is thus that tranſlations from the Spaniſh would convey to the Engliſh public ſome idea of the originals; and although many expreſſions may be polite and elegant in one language, and very vulgar in another, yet thoſe who read to acquire accurate ideas of foreign manners and cuſtoms, will prefer cloſe to free tranſlations; they will ſelect faithful portraits, however homely, rather than ſplendid pictures, which have no prototypes in nature. Let us not be underſtood, however, as condemning all free tranſlations; on the contrary, they have their uſe, and we ſhould wiſh to ſee both literal and free tranſlations of all foreign works of merit, in every caſe where there are but few perſons in the country acquainted with the originals. We are much deceived, indeed, if good poetical tranſlations of theſe very comedies before us would not be as favourably received by the public as the Honey Moon has been.

The third and laſt piece in this volume is from the pen of Don Anthony de Solis, entitled, *Un Bobo hace Ciento* (one fool makes a hundred) "One Fool makes Many." Solis is a writer of a character very different from Calderon; the latter is much more original and energetic, the former much more poliſhed, gentle, and uniform; in the one nature ſeems to have done every thing, in the other art. We are compelled to admire even the extravagance of Calderon for its originality, and we cannot be offended at the amenity and often highly poliſhed numbers of Solis, even when he deſcends to goſſiping and tattle. In character and incident, indeed, the comedy here tranſlated is more copious than the preceding, and there is more buſtle and ridicule, but leſs ardour and moral ſentiment. There are nine perſonages, and as many peculiar characters, three nobles and their two ſervants; and two ladies with their two ſervants, all of whom have conſpicuous parts. Of the three gentlemen two are very reſpectable characters; the other is a cowardly fool, always boaſting of his nobility, and always attempting to gallant with women, not unlike Sir John Falſtaff. Of the two former, the one marries the ſiſter of this fooliſh noble, and the other his friend's ſiſter, while the pompous grandee is running every where ſeeking interviews, and paying his addreſſes to all his female acquaintances; who, he

thinks, are all desperately in love with him. His sister, however, who is more rational, is abandoned by her first lover, in order that she may accept the hand of his friend, in which there is more sentimental honour than genuine rectitude; although the incident by which it is brought about is very natural. Of the male servants, one is a romantic humorist, and the other is treacherous and covetous; the females are represented as covetous and unfaithful. The stratagems used to effect secret interviews between these parties, by means of their respective servants, constitute the incidents of the piece, and are often highly facetious. The following scene of the second act will convey some idea of this Biscayan noble's character. In one of his preparatory reveries he sallies out of his house with a candle and a sword drawn, speaking to himself.

"*D. Cosmo.* Now it will do! I have not only composed the harangue in which I will make love to Donna Anna, but I have been practising how I will attack any impertinent fellow who may chance to interrupt me while I am in her chamber; and after having fought him so successfully through half the rooms in my own house, I'll warrant you I shall know how to deal with him if he comes against me in his own proper person. I have been swearing at him too; for I always swear when I fight. I hope my sister did not hear me; it would have frightened her out of her wits to have seen what a passion I was in. But I dare say she has been in bed and asleep for an hour or two. Now, sword, return to thy scabbard! Full well does it know that this is the first time I ever returned thee to it untinged with blood!—*Juancho* (his servant within) Walk off, you impudent hussies!—*D. Cosmo.* Juancho, what is the matter? (Enter Juancho) —*Juan.* I found two women there standing in the porch.—*D. Cos.* Women! of what condition?—*Juan.* Of a very bad condition, I believe, for all they had silk gowns on.—*D. Cos.* Poor things! I suppose they were watching for a sight of me. I have very often such visitors, who come to complain of my cruelty. But you need not have been so rough with them, Juancho. Are they gone?—*Juan.* O yes.—*D. Cos.* I am not at all surprized at such an adventure. There are a great many ladies who would give their ears to be able to make some impression on my heart: and especially when they know that I am of the blood of the Mendietas, which my father bequeathed to me by his last will and testament. But I want to know whether you have seen Juana? [the servant bribed to introduce D. C. to her mistress's apartment]. What says she to the ladder?—*Juan.* She says that it will do very well, and that she will be sure to have every thing ready for you.—*D. Cos.* To see the effect now of a few dobloons! *(Aside).* A faithful fellow this! my own countryman. My life to a ducat he won't blab. I believe Juana is a good strong wench.—*Juan.* O, very strong.—*D. Cos.* That point is of some consequence, as we must trust to her to fasten the ladder at top. I say she ought to

be ſtrong.—*Juan.* Never fear as to that matter, Sir.—*D. Coſ.* All my family are remarkable for their averſion to falls. We are of a finer contexture than men of vulgar birth; and the bones of a Mendieta are as brittle as glaſs. But now come; it is time we attempt this eſcalade. I ſhall lock up all my doors, however, firſt; for I muſt not forget I have a ſiſter in my houſe; and ſiſters muſt be kept more ſtrictly than Sundays. *Exeunt.*"

We have ſelected the above, not from its particular merit, for there are many more ludicrous or intereſting ſcenes, but for its ſhortneſs, as we have already devoted a ſufficient number of pages to this volume. It may ſeem ſtrange that the character of a noble ſhould be held up to ridicule, as here exhibited; but it ſhould be obſerved, that this noble is a Biſcayan, and not a Caſtilian; hence the origin of one of the greateſt evils which ever infeſted Spain, the want of union, or rather the jealouſy and enmity, between its different provinces. This ruinous provincialiſm ſtill prevails with unabated fury among the majority of the people even of the preſent day. As to the provincial nobles, although there are many of them men of very extenſive knowledge and virtues, yet there are alſo ſome grievouſly deficient in both theſe qualities, and it may appear to ſome almoſt incredible, when we aſſert that there is, perhaps, more than one noble in Spain, even at the preſent day, who can neither read nor write!

As to the relative merit of theſe comedies and tranſlation, if we compare them with the proſe tranſlations of ſome of the beſt French pieces, we ſhall certainly be convinced of their great ſuperiority. In general, the Pariſian plays conſiſt merely of a ſcene in a drawing-room, where two or three perſons, more than half of whom are ſervants, contrive ſome love intrigue, which, with two or three long declamations, conſtitutes a French drama. In character and incident, indeed, the Spaniſh excel; and it muſt be acknowledged, that "La invencion, la gracia, y traza, es propia á la ingenioſa fabula de Eſpana." The preſent volume may be read with pleaſure, and what is more, if not with advantage, at leaſt without prejudice, to morality by all deſcriptions of perſons. We can, therefore, recommend it as affording more innocent amuſement than moſt of the circulating library volumes, and more novelty than moſt of our modern novels.

Plain Facts; or a Review of the Conduct of the late Miniſters; to which is added a Poſtſcript. Third Edition, corrected. 8vo. Pp. 109. 3s. J. J. Stockdale, Pall-Mall. 1807.

THIS is one of the moſt temperate and able pamphlets to which the late controverſy reſpecting the diſmiſſion of the Grenville adminiſtration has given birth. The author is evidently a man of ſenſe, information, judgment, and talents; he is perfect maſter of his ſubject, and, notwithſtanding the many diſcuſſions which it has undergone, he gives it a freſh intereſt, by the manner in which he treats it. Adverting to the formation of the late miniſtry by Lord Grenville, he obſerves:

"Thus Mr. Fox and his friends, after a violent oppoſition of two and twenty years, came into power, and on ſuch triumphant terms, that nearly the whole of the patronage of the ſtate was ſurrendered into their hands. It will not be eaſily forgotten, how greedily their ſituations were in the firſt inſtance ſeized on, and with what little delicacy or diſcrimination matters were ſubſequently managed. Officers who had never been diſplaced before, were turned out without ceremony, to make room for freſh candidates; and ſuch were the multitude and the earneſtneſs of applications, that numbers were left unprovided for, and conſequently unſatisfied."

We have heard anecdotes, on this ſubject, ſo extraordinary as almoſt to exceed credibility; indeed, the ſtruggle for place, among the ſubordinate retainers of the party, ſeemed more like the contentions of a gang of hungry vagrants for a portion of a ſtolen loaf, than a decent competition for a proviſion among men qualified to obtain it. Having ſeated them in power, our author takes a curſory view of their firſt official acts.

"The firſt public effort of theſe gentlemen, after their acceſſion to power, was to get through parliament an act, enabling Lord Grenville to hold the auditorſhip of the exchequer, with the ſituation of firſt lord of the treaſury, in which they ſucceeded, and by which his lordſhip became auditor of his *own* accounts. The next public effort, in which they alſo ſucceeded, was to enable Lord Ellenborough, the chief juſtice of the King's Bench, to hold a ſeat in the cabinet, empowering him to hear *ex parte* evidence; to be proſecutor in his miniſterial capacity in a cauſe, which, in his judicial capacity, he might afterwards have to try; and, conſequently, to blend in the ſame perſon the irreconcileable characters of accuſer, jury, and judge. Both theſe meaſures have been ſo amply diſcuſſed, in and out of parliament, and are, on the very face of them, ſuch glaring violations of conſtitutional law, coming home ſo forcibly to every man's common ſenſe, that it cannot be neceſſary to make any comment on them here. They are, however, alone quite ſufficient to prove, how very differently the Foxites thought and felt in oppoſite ſituations. Had two ſuch innovations, in former times, been only hinted at, theſe ſturdy patriots would have reprobated them in the

ſevereſt language, as dangerous and unjuſt encroachments on our moſt ſacred privileges, and would have ſounded the alarm from one end of the kingdom to the other. But the moment they could be converted to their perſonal advantage, the danger and the injuſtice vaniſhed, and they received their moſt ſtrenuous ſupport. Such a ſudden and total dereliction of principles and profeſſions was ſufficient to open the eyes of every one to their motives; and clearly explained, why they had been ſo clamorous in ſupporting what they denominated the unalienable rights of the people, when in oppoſition; and why they were ſo eager to ſurrender thoſe rights, when in power.

"Theſe difficult points being ſettled, by which two of their leading men were rivetted to their intereſts, ſome time was taken up in ſubordinate official arrangements; in diſcarding old ſervants of the public, to make room for old friends of the party. Every office was abſolutely ranſacked; and ſuch was the indiſcriminate voracity of the candidates, that the loweſt ſtations were accepted with the keeneſt avidity. So little delicacy, or even decorum, was diſplayed in many of theſe changes, that, in various inſtances, the credit of the adminiſtration was deeply diſgraced. Even in the higher departments, the ſtrangeſt anomalies were committed, and ſuch urgent claims were preferred from different quarters, that conſiderable confuſion was every where apparent. Mr. Fox was ſo inceſſantly beſieged by the numerous clan of his old and needy aſſociates, ſo many obſcure adventurers were petitioners to his bounty, that he is reported to have one day exclaimed, in the anguiſh of his heart, 'What, in God's name, can I do more? We are already three in a bed.' It was however at laſt determined, among other *diſcreet* appointments, that Mr. Sheridan ſhould be treaſurer of the navy, and Mr. Daviſon treaſurer of the ordnance; that Mr. Tierney, who had been toſſed about like a ſhuttlecock from one party to the other, ſhould be at the head of the board of controul; that the great ſeal of Scotland ſhould be taken from the Duke of Gordon, and conſigned to the cuſtody of the Earl of Lauderdale; that Mr. Erſkine, who had ſcarcely ever been in the court of chancery, even as a viſitor, ſhould be raiſed to the dignity of lord high chancellor; that General Fox, who had already received one of the moſt lucrative military appointments in the King's gift, ſhould commence a diplomatic career, and ſuperſede Mr. Elliot as envoy extraordinary and miniſter plenipotentiary at the court of Palermo; that Mr. Singleton, Lord Cornwallis's ſon-in-law, and the only connection of that illuſtrious nobleman in the employ of government, ſhould be ſupplanted at the ordnance office by Colonel Mac Mahon; and that George Hanger, in remuneration for his long and faithful ſervices, ſhould be gratified with a troop of horſe artillery worth 1000*l* per annum."

A volume would ſcarcely ſuffice to explain the profligacy and the evil tendency of ſuch monſtrous appointments, and of ſuch indecent conduct. We have ſo frequently declared our ſentiments on this ſubject, and the author's opinions are

ſo perfectly coincident with our own, that it is needleſs to add our animadverſions to his comments. His view of the political and military achievements of this aſſemblage of talents concludes with this pithy and pertinent remark: "So little did the boldneſs of enterprize mingle with their deliberations, that, for the thirteen months during which they held the reins of empire, the ſtrength and reſources of the ſtate were completely *paralyzed* [paſſied], and Great Britain, with her mighty revenue, her powerful armies, and her invincible fleets, accompliſhed little more than might have been expected from the puny exertions of ſome petty ſtate."

Our author extends his examination to the perſons ſelected to repreſent our Sovereign at foreign courts.

"The various diplomatic arrangements which took place whilſt they continued in power next demand our attention. In theſe, the groſſeſt errors were committed, and perſons moſt unfit for office were, in many inſtances, appointed. Among the leading characters whom they introduced into this line, was Lord Lauderdale, a nobleman certainly not very popular in this country, and who had been an early and profeſſed admirer of that horrible revolution, which diſſolved thoſe privileged orders of ſociety of which he is himſelf a member, and which has been the prolific ſource of thoſe dreadful calamities with which Europe has, for the laſt ſeventeen years, been viſited. If, however, he had not been a friend to his country, he had been a friend to the party; and their gratitude deemed him worthy of reward. He was originally deſtined for India, and had been nominated to the higheſt and moſt lucrative poſt in that diſtant part of the empire. The objections however to him were ſo inſurmountable, on the ſide of the directors of the Eaſt India Company, whoſe approbation is neceſſary to confirm the choice of his Majeſty's miniſters, that, after conſiderable altercation, it was thought prudent to retreat from the ſtruggle. In remuneration for this ſignal and mortifying diſappointment, which muſt have conveyed to the mind of the noble lord no very flattering teſtimony of public eſteem, he received as a ſinecure the great ſeal of Scotland, and was afterwards pitched upon as a proper perſon to conduct the negotiation which had been opened with France. The Marquis of Douglas was, about the ſame time, appointed ambaſſador at the court of St. Peterſburg. A perfect novice in politics, untrained to official duties, he could not be ſuppoſed to be in poſſeſſion of any of thoſe qualifications, which, at a criſis like the preſent, ought to have recommended him to ſuch a diſtinction. In this country he was totally unknown, except as a perſon who had rendered himſelf ridiculous by aping in his dreſs the German coſtume. After loitering away his time for ſeveral months in England, in chooſing his ſervice of plate, and ſtocking his wardrobe, he at length ſet out for his deſtination; and, during a reſidence of a few months at St. Peterſburg, has con-

trived completely to diſſatisfy his own countrymen, and to diſguſt the court at which he is accredited."

If the miniſters had intended to render their Sovereign and their country contemptible in the eyes of foreigners, they could not have ſelected a more fit object for carrying ſuch intentions into full effect, than this ſprig of Scottiſh nobility, who ſoon became a ſubject of ridicule to the Ruſſians, from the Grand Duke Conſtantine to the ſentinel at the palace gate. The author exhibits an inſtance of his incapacity which proves him to be deſtitute of common ſenſe.

"Both our political and commercial connections with Ruſſia have, indeed, been moſt lamentably neglected. Even the treaty of commerce which was concluded by Lord Whitworth a few years back, and which was ſo likely to perpetuate a friendly intercourſe between the two empires, was allowed to expire, without any proviſion having been effected for the protection of the Britiſh factories eſtabliſhed in various parts of the Ruſſian dominions. In conſequence of this ſhameful omiſſion, Britiſh merchants are now reſident there, on the ſame footing as Ruſſian ſubjects, the Emperor, as a deſpotic monarch, having it in his power to detain them, or to oppreſs them, as he ſhall think fit. In this dilemma, they lately applied to Lord Douglas, as the repreſentative of their country, and as their natural protector, to concert the plan which it would be moſt adviſable to purſue, to extricate them from their difficulties. To this end it was judged expedient to draw up a ſtatement of the grievances to which they were expoſed, and to point out thoſe privileges which they thought themſelves juſtified in demanding. This paper was delivered to his Excellency, that he might be thoroughly acquainted with the deplorable ſituation to which they were reduced; and, that he might be furniſhed with arguments which might be ſucceſsfully urged in their favour. But what does this ſubtle politician do? Why this very paper, which contains many ſevere remarks on the Ruſſian character, and on the conſtitutional rights of the Emperor, and which was ſubmitted to him for his private inſpection, that he might regulate his application by his own diſcretion, he preſents to the Ruſſian government*. The miniſters were naturally ſurpriſed and offended;

"* The memorial of the Britiſh factory at St. Peterſburg to Lord Douglas, is dated 14th February 1807, and was preſented on the 16th. It was accompanied with a letter of the ſame date, containing a few additional obſervations, and concluding with this remarkable caution: 'the freedom with which we have offered our ſentiments, we truſt, the conjuncture warrants. Where ſo much is at ſtake, and the danger ſo imminent for ourſelves, our friends, and our country, a frank repreſentation of what we fear as well as of what we feel, will ſurely be excuſed, not to ſay approved, by your

and thus has the miſunderſtanding been widened, and the difficulty of adjuſting it, to the ſatisfaction of the parties, increaſed. If things ſhould long continue in this ſtate, that part of the commerce which is moſt advantageous to Great Britain will be infallibly forfeited. All our ſubſtantial merchants will withdraw as faſt as they can wind up their concerns; and the trade will be transferred to the management of a ſet of needy or deſperate adventurers."

Such was the repreſentative of the Britiſh monarch at the court of St. Peterſburgh!! Nor was our gracious Sovereign much better repreſented at Vienna.

"At the court of Vienna, a court which, however fallen in dignity, ſtill prides itſelf on the antiquity of its nobility, the ſplendour of its appearance, and the forms of its ceremonial, the ſon of an army ſurgeon was commiſſioned to repreſent the dignity of the Britiſh nation. I ſhall not ſtop to inquire by what ties either Mr. Adair or his father were originally united to Mr. Fox's party; but I know that Mr. Adair the ſon, ſome years back, during a ſerious difference pending between this country and Ruſſia, was diſpatched by Mr. Fox, as a kind of authorized agent from the oppoſition, to the Empreſs Catharine; and it was for this reaſon that the preſent King of Sweden, when Mr. Adair was appointed to ſucceed Mr. Pierrepoint, for which office he was originally deſtined, abſolutely refuſed to receive him. He ſaid, that a man who had been employed againſt the intereſts of his own country for the promotion of party views, was an unfit perſon to reſide in a public character at his court."

There was ſomething ſtill more extraordinary attending this

Lordſhip, and by his Majeſty's miniſters in England. To them, therefore, we requeſt the favour of its being tranſmitted, without delay, and without reſerve. In the mean time, your Lordſhip will judge how the ſuggeſtions it contains can be beſt employed to ſtrengthen our cauſe at this court, fully aware, as your Lordſhip no doubt muſt be, of the extreme delicacy requiſite in regard to committing either the factory or its deputies with a government, which as yet recognizes no right in any claſs, even of natives, to arraign the conduct of a miniſter, much leſs to diſcuſs the mandate of a Sovereign.'

"After ſuch a caution, what muſt have been the aſtoniſhment and alarm of the Britiſh factory, when, on the following day, February 17th, they received a letter from their ambaſſador, beginning in theſe terms?

"'Gentlemen,

"'I will not, nor is it neceſſary to compliment you on the memorial I received yeſterday, when I inform you, that I ſent it to his Excellency General Budberg with a note of mine on the ſame ſubject,' &c. &c."

extraordinary appointment of Mr. Robert Adair. He was married to a French woman; and even Mr. Fox was ſo fully aware of the impropriety of ſuffering ſuch a wife to accompany him, at ſuch a criſis, to the imperial court, that he made it a condition of his appointment that he ſhould leave her in England. It would naturally have occurred, however, to any other miniſters than theſe, that, if there were any danger in having the ambaſſador ſubjected to the influence of this female politician (and that *they* thought there was is evident from the condition which they preſcribed), it was highly improper to appoint him, becauſe the influence might be exerted through the medium of letters as well as by a perſonal communication. We muſt expreſs our ſurpriſe that Mr. Adair has been ſuffered to retain his ſituation, and that his wife has been allowed to join him! We proceed with the catalogue of our ſage diplomatiſts.

"Of infinitely higher importance however to ourſelves, were our arrangements with America. But to render our views, in that quarter, as liable to defeat as poſſible, Mr. Merry was recalled, and our intereſts were committed to the talents and diſcretion of one of Lord Erſkine's ſons, a young man without knowledge or experience, married to an American lady, and having a father who has inveſted, in the funds of the United States, the greateſt part of his property, and who, before he was chancellor, was in the habit of recommending all his clients, and all his friends, to ſettle there, as the only region of the globe where rational freedom could be enjoyed. On what principles of policy ſuch an appointment could have taken place, I am at a loſs to diſcover. Poſſibly, indeed, it was conſidered prudent to make it perfectly agreeable to America, and to regard the wiſhes of Great Britain as of ſecondary moment. Certain it is, that conceſſions moſt unworthy of our honour, and moſt injurious to our intereſts, have already been ſubmitted to. The navigation laws, which have, in the opinion of all the moſt eminent political writers, ſo long been the foundation and the ſupport of our naval glory and our commercial proſperity, have received a fatal blow. Our rights as a belligerent, to ſtop, ſearch, and detain, neutral veſſels, and to prevent them from becoming the carriers of the colonial property of our enemies, have been moſt unwiſely ſurrendered; and by the new regulations which have been introduced into the maritime code in favour of the Americans, they, conjointly with the French, Spaniards, and Dutch, whom they aſſiſt, reap all the advantage, and we ſuffer all the inconvenience and the loſs*."

"* Since the American intercourſe bill, a treaty has been agreed on between our government and the American miniſter in London, extending ſtill further theſe injurious privileges. By this treaty,

The *particular* remarks are followed by ſome *general* reflections on the importance of ſelecting proper ambaſſadors, and on our ſyſtem of diplomacy, as contraſted with that of the French. Theſe are moſt ſenſible and judicious, and highly worthy the attention of ſtateſmen. Equally excellent are the author's obſervations on the Catholic queſtion, and on the occurrences which preceded and produced the diſmiſſion of the late miniſters. He very properly reminds the public of a fact, which the rude aſſailants of Mr. Pitt have always choſen either to overlook or to miſrepreſent. Speaking of Catholic emancipation, he ſays, "In the memorable debate which took place on this intereſting topic, it was explicitly declared, both by Mr. Pitt and Lord Grenville, that *no pledge had been given by them to the Catholics:* ſo that they both ſtood completely abſolved from any charge of inconſiſtency, in accepting, at different periods, the offer of a return to power." This is perfectly true, and cannot be too generally

---

they are allowed openly to carry the colonial produce of France and Spain to the mother country, provided it is firſt taken to America, and pays to the American government a duty of two per cent, which is to be admitted as a proof of a change of property. In this manner will our *declared* enemies, by the intervention of our *ſecret* enemies, receive the produce of their colonies at half the expence at which we, as abſolute maſters of the ſea, can receive ours. The trade of the Eaſt Indies is alſo to be thrown open to theſe commercial rivals. Such are the indulgences which we grant to America, in conſequence of her inſolence, ingratitude, and injuſtice towards us; and at a moment when ſhe is exerciſing all her malevolence againſt our manufactures by her non-importation regulations. But what is ſtill more ſurpriſing, and will ſcarcely be credited, ſo tender have our late miniſters been of giving offence, ſo fearful of exciting American wrath, that not a word is mentioned in this treaty about our right to claim Britiſh ſailors from American ſhips, which are known to contain many thouſands of theſe brave and invaluable defenders of their country. Is not this ſilence a proof of a virtual abandonment of this important point? Is it not a proof that our government, ſubdued by a criminal puſillanimity, has been afraid to protect their countrymen, and to aſſert our unqueſtionable right on a ſubject which ſo vitally concerns us? Has not the American government naturally enough drawn this inference from our daſtardly fears? and is it not ſaid, notwithſtanding the treaty is in every reſpect, where it is explanatory, ſo favourable to them, and ſo injurious to us, that, arguing from our meek ſubmiſſion on other points, and from the evident cowardice which our ſilence betrays on this, they now refuſe to ratify the agreement *in toto*, unleſs we formally conſent to this additional degradation? Fortunately for the intereſts of this country, America has now a firmer government to deal with."

known.—We ſhall now extract a paſſage, in which the claims of the Romaniſts to a participation of political power, and the grounds of their *conditional* excluſion, that is, of their non-admiſſion without ſubmitting to the ſame terms which are impoſed, indiſcriminately, on all their fellow-ſubjects, are placed in a ſtrong and proper point of view.

"The queſtion immediately under our conſideration has been divided by ſome into two heads, viz. as matter of right, and as matter of expediency. I never could perceive the neceſſity or the policy of the diſtinction. The terms are, in this inſtance, blended in ſignification. A meaſure of ſuch a nature can only be *right*, as far as it is *expedient;* that is, as far as it is conſonant with the general welfare of the ſtate. Private advantages muſt yield to the benefit of the community; the privileges of individuals muſt be regulated by public good. This is the ſcale which muſt, in all caſes, be conſulted. What, in fact, is legitimate power, but an aggregate fund derived from the original rights of each member of ſociety, and which is the price that ſocial man pays out of the ſtock of his natural liberty for the protection which the laws afford him? The only mode, therefore, in my judgment, in which this queſtion can be agitated with utility or with ſafety, is to endeavour ſo to contrive, that, if ever the conceſſions, which the Catholics require, ſhould be obtained, they ſhould be the reſult of conviction, and not of violence, faction, or intrigue. Some people have ſaid, Grant this as a boon to the Iriſh Catholics, and you make them your friends; withhold it, and you make them your enemies. This is preſumptuous, and, I truſt, erroneous language; and thoſe who uſe it, whatever they may pretend to be, are no real friends to the cauſe which they eſpouſe. They would extort by compulſion as a right, inſtead of receiving with good will as a gratuity. They would put the iſſue on the ſtrength of the ſuitor, and not on the juſtice of his claim. They would convert a queſtion of reaſon into a queſtion of blood. But lamentably weak would that government be, which could be induced to yield from ſuch a motive; and I have no heſitation in ſaying, that if ſuch a daring and unconſtitutional ſpirit ſhould really betray itſelf, ſo long as it exiſted, they ought never to be liſtened to. If the Catholics ſhould ever begin ſtipulating for terms; if they ſhould ever mete out loyalty by way of bargain; if they ſhould ever threaten, that they will only remain conditionally faithful to that government which they are bound, not only by allegiance, but by every tie of intereſt and affection, to ſupport; they will then have proclaimed themſelves our enemies: and if conceſſions were ſubmitted to in conſequence of ſuch a demeanour, the Catholics would be triumphant, and the Proteſtants ſubdued. But that ſuch traitorous ſentiments are neither cheriſhed nor entertained by the Catholics, I am fully perſuaded; and that they ſhould have been broached by their pretended friends, beſpeaks, on the part of ſuch advocates, neither deſire of conciliation, nor ſobriety of argument, nor attachment to their country.

"Without entering into unneceſſary argument, reſpecting the ſuperior merits of a particular church, we know, from all experience, that any religion is better than none. We alſo know, that in moſt countries, out of the endleſs variety, one has generally been ſelected, to which a decided preference has been ſhewn by the legiſlature, by providing for its miniſters in a manner ſuitable to the opulence of the country, and the ſanctity of the inſtitution. Religion, however, of whatever deſcription, exerciſes a powerful influence over the moral conduct of the world, and mingles with almoſt every affection of the heart, and every duty of life. It thus naturally connects itſelf with the civil government; for civil laws are beſt ſupported by morality, and morality derives its chief ſecurity from a proper deference to religion. Hence in all communities the cloſe aſſociation between church and ſtate. Moſt fortunate, however, is that country, in which religion is founded on juſt and liberal views; for in that country, induſtry, liberty, toleration, good morals, and every virtue which leads to the true happineſs and proſperity of ſociety, are moſt likely to flouriſh.

"When, in this country, Catholiciſm was the creed of the national church, the weight of its power was every where felt. That unbounded authority which it aſſumed, and which it enforced by ſuch cruel and arbitrary means, contributed, more than any other cauſe, to ſtifle the energies of the ſoul; to check the ſpirit of inquiry; and to retard the progreſs of induſtry, ſcience, and freedom. The Reformation, although it had been long ſilently working its way, and removing, with the implements of reaſon, the weeds and brambles which choaked up the road to knowledge, was nevertheleſs produced before its time. The ſeparation of England from the Church of Rome was leſs the effect of moral conviction, than of the whimſical and headſtrong paſſions which dictated to the reſolves of one of the moſt odious tyrants that ever ſwayed the ſceptre of theſe realms. At that time, however, the Anglican Church aroſe, of which the king became the declared head; and notwithſtanding the circumſtances which attended its origin, the cloſe connection between church and ſtate which has ſince prevailed (a ſhort period excepted) has eſſentially contributed to the ſecurity of the eccleſiaſtical and civil eſtabliſhments of the country. The ſtruggles which the Catholics made in the time of Elizabeth, and particularly in the time of the Stuarts, for the reſtoration of their faith, naturally created jealouſy on the part of the Proteſtants; and in 1678 a teſt act was paſſed, which excluded from parliament Catholic peers. At the glorious revolution of 1688, this reſtriction was continued, and it was a principal object, amidſt the arduous labours of the many illuſtrious men, who, at that fortunate and memorable æra, led the public mind, for ever to prevent their return. They had obſerved, how intimately the tenets of the Church of Rome were linked with the exerciſe and maintenance of arbitrary power, and how much the ſafety of a free conſtitution depended on the excluſion of its members from all participation in the enactment or the execution of the laws. As an additional rampart

for the protection of civil liberty, these enlightened and patriotic statesmen unalterably regulated the royal line of succession, and secured the inheritance of the crown to a race of Protestant princes. The tests of the two preceding reigns were, at the same time, further fortified, and the church and state were, by several solemn acts, indissolubly united. Many other penal and disabling statutes were passed against the Catholics in the succeeding reigns, and it was only at the accession of his present majesty to the throne, that the government began to view them with less distrust. They have felt the full benefit of this favourable disposition. The penal laws against them have been gradually abrogated; their disabilities have been gradually rescinded; and they have been gradually restored to the enjoyment of religious toleration, of civil right, and of personal freedom. Every odious and burdensome restriction being thus removed, both the reason and justice of the case, as they apply to farther concession, seem now to be reduced to a simple question of expedience and prudence. Some assert, that we might grant the full extent of their claims without any risk: others contend, that it would be attended with the greatest. When there is such a wide difference of opinion; when such contrary inferences are deduced from the same premises, and by persons of equally liberal views, and of equally extensive experience; it is, at least, a proof of the difficulty of deciding right. This is a strong argument for continuing as we are. We know what our present situation is: it is difficult to foretel what it might be. We know the advantages of a Protestant church: we have every reason to dread the predominance of Popery. The Catholics must, indeed, themselves, be fully sensible of the difficulties with which this question is encumbered. They must be aware, that, interfering as it does with some of the fundamental principles of the constitution, it involves considerations of peculiar delicacy and magnitude; and that, above all, the wishes and prejudices of the Protestants, who make four-fifths of the aggregate population of our European empire, must, on a point which so nearly concerns them, be indispensably consulted."

This is the language of a wise man and a sound politician, who not only appreciates principles, but weighs consequences. We had marked many other passages for the purpose of quoting, but our limits compel us to abridge both our extracts and remarks. We shall, therefore, conclude our notice of this valuable tract, which we strenuously recommend to the perusal of our readers, with the author's sentiments on the King's conduct, in his strict adherence to his coronation oath.

"From the foregoing pages, in which I have endeavoured to compress this very important subject as much as possible, it is evident that the King, in withholding his consent to the demands of the Catholics, as recently proposed to him through his ministers, has not

only exercised his just prerogative, but that he has exercised it in a manner which is congenial to the almost unanimous wishes of his Protestant subjects, as but two years ago solemnly declared, and strictly conformable to the fundamental laws of the constitution. He is bound by his coronation oath to support the Protestant Church, and if he be not concerned in the interpretation of that oath, who is? If then his Majesty, in his conscience, think that any further indulgence to the Roman Catholics would materially shake the interests of that Church, of which he is the guardian and the head; or that it would amount to a violation of that oath by which he holds his crown; what minister is not bound to respect such a conclusion? The oaths of abjuration and supremacy are, indeed, constituent parts of the bill of rights, in which they were inserted by the Convention Parliament, as bulwarks necessary for the defence of the privileges of the people against the encroachments of the crown, and against the return of a Roman Catholic jurisdiction. Is then the King to be blamed, for refusing to grant what would amount to a renunciation of the fundamental laws of the realm, and what, had it been proposed in the time of William III, would have been matter of impeachment? Is the King to be placed so entirely at the mercy of his ministers; is he to be so completely tied up in the trammels of non-resistance; that he is, on no occasion, to venture an opinion of his own? Suppose that his ministers had counselled the abolition of the trial by jury; will any one pretend to say that he would have been still bound to yield? How then is this system of compliance to be stopped, but by the King's determination to resist? Would we wish him to imitate James II instead of William III? or is our history so silent on the evils arising out of contentions between the King and his parliament, that we can be indifferent about their revival* ? I must, therefore, insist, that, in whatever point of view the schism between the King and his late ministers is considered, his Majesty has acted in a

---

"* It has been said, that the language of these times is widely different from that which was held in the days of William III. It certainly is, for such language in his days would, as I have observed above, have been impeachable. It has been also said, that William the Third's ministers were in the habit of giving him advice which was personally disagreeable to him, particularly in what concerned the dismissal of his Dutch guards. As far as the *disagreeableness* of the advice goes, our late ministers have certainly not fallen short of the laudable precedent established above a century ago. In other respects, they have far surpassed the merits of their ancestors. William the Third's ministers might with impunity *advise* him to dismiss his Dutch guards; but had they threatened to bring a bill into parliament, to *compel* him to dismiss his Dutch guards, would he not have *dismissed* them? Had the late ministers only given their *advice*, they might have kept their places. William was indeed obliged to dismiss his Dutch guards, but it was in consequence of a resolution of the House of Commons, in which his ministers took no part."

manner every way worthy of his exalted rank; every way worthy of his dignity, as the conſtitutional king of a free country; and that he has afforded an additional proof, if any were wanting, of his ſacred regard for his public duties, and of the watchful zeal and tenderneſs with which he has ever contemplated the general intereſts of his empire."

Edinburgh Medical and Phyſical Dictionary, containing an Explanation of the Terms of Arts in Anatomy, Phyſiology, Pathology, Therapeutics, Surgery, Midwifery, Pharmacy, Materia Medica, Botany, Chemiſtry, Natural Hiſtory, &c. &c. as employed in the preſent improved State of Medical Science; and alſo a copious Account of Diſeaſes and their Treatment, agreeably to the Doctrines of Cullen, Monro, Hunter, Fordyce, Gregory, Denham, Saunders, Home, and other modern Teachers in Edinburgh and London. To which is added, a copious Gloſſary of Obſolete Terms, calculated to aſſiſt thoſe who have Occaſion to refer to the Writings of the Ancients. By Robert Morris, M. D.; James Kendrick, Surgeon, F.L.S.; and others. In two volumes, 4to, with ſixty-ſix plates; about 2,000 pages. 4l 4s. Bell and Bradfute, Edinburgh; Oſtell, London. 1807.

"BOOKS crowd in daily, and are heaped on books," obſerved the learned Baker, "yet knowledge has no enemies but the ignorant." If this obſervation was juſtifiable a century ago, how much more ſo is it in the preſent day? The character of books, however, has changed not leſs than their quantity has increaſed; and inſtead of numerous diſtinct treatiſes, we have now nothing but ponderous volumes of encyclopedias, embracing the whole circle of the arts and ſciences. The more modeſt claſs of Dictionaries has alſo become numerous, but in proportion as they are leſs aſſuming they are in general more uſeful; and the improved editions of the Gardener's Dictionary by Miller, and the Medical Dictionary by Motherby, have long been works, in their reſpective departments, of an intrinſic merit very ſuperior to any rival publications under the ſounding title of Encyclopedia. It may, indeed, be eaſily believed, that an individual, empaſſioned in the ſtudy of any one branch of ſcience, may produce a very complete and accurate account of all its details, arranged in the order of Dictionaries; but ſhould the ſame individual attempt a ſimilar labour in a department of which he had previouſly very little acquaintance, and as little taſte for it, his production, in the latter caſe, muſt be in every eſ-

ſential point greatly inferior to the preceding. Such is the general ſtate of the modern encyclopediſts; nor can numbers obviate this objection, as, where many perſons are employed, each in his own particular branch, numerous articles will occur which cannot properly be conſidered as excluſively the department of any one, and which of courſe will either be entirely neglected, or executed in a manner which leaves a much ſtronger impreſſion of the preſumption than the knowledge of its author. In this manner all works aſſuming the character of univerſal ever have been, and perhaps will be, imperfect. Good Dictionaries, therefore, confined to a moderate compaſs on particular branches of ſciences, ſuch as we have mentioned, will always be more uſeful than voluminous and expenſive compilations of arts and ſciences.

Of all the ſciences, indeed, that of medicine is perhaps the moſt copious, and the moſt diverſified; no man can be a good phyſician who is not intimately acquainted with all the details of the eleven different articles mentioned in the title of this work, not one of which is in the leaſt degree redundant, or even diſpenſable. This is a fact worthy of the moſt ſerious conſideration of parents, who ought not to deſtine fopplings or ſimpletons to the ſtudy of a profeſſion which concerns the health and lives of their ſpecies, and which particularly requires vigorous talents, great induſtry, and the ſoundeſt judgment. Were there more attention paid to this important conſideration, the number of deaths in our annual bills of mortality would be ſeveral thouſands leſs; and many of thoſe complaints, miſnomered nervous diſeaſes, the joint offspring of luxury and ignorance, would not then be known. It is true, the increaſe of labour, of population, and conſequent anxiety of mind, has rendered many diſeaſes common that would otherwiſe, perhaps, never have had exiſtence; but all theſe are trifling evils compared with the iniquitous trafficking ſpirit of quackery, the effects of which daily deſtroy the lives of hundreds. The groſs and culpable ignorance alſo of the inferior dealers in the healing art, who have ſuch frequent opportunities of working on the feelings of patients, is equally lamentable and injurious. Of the extraordinary incapacity, or rather imbecility, indeed, of ſome of this claſs, our courts of juſtice have recently exhibited a memorable inſtance. There is no profeſſion, properly ſo called, in which ignorance is not a poſitive crime, for which it is extremely difficult to apportion an adequate puniſhment. An ignorant clergyman renders religion contemptible, and thus injures public morals; an ignorant lawyer betrays his client

by loſing his cauſe; and an ignorant medical practitioner only *kills* his patient! In this view, therefore, we cannot be inimical to Dictionaries, whether of religion, law, or phyſic, as their novelty and variety muſt tend to attract the attention of at leaſt a part of the profeſſors for which they are particularly deſigned, and conſequently to diminiſh, in ſome degree, the quantum of ignorance which ſtill exiſts among practitioners, and thus confer a general benefit on ſociety.

With reſpect to the Dictionary before us, the relative qualifications and taſtes of the authors ſeem to have been very happily applied in the formation of two copious and intereſting volumes of medicinal ſcience. From a work like the preſent, it will not be expected that we ſhould give any long extracts, as ſpecimens of its ſtyle and manner, but confine ourſelves ſimply to ſtate impartially what we think are its peculiar merits and defects. The authors very modeſtly profeſs their readineſs, and we do not doubt their ſincerity, to avail themſelves of any remarks calculated to improve their work in a future impreſſion. We would, therefore, recommend them to introduce more minute deſcriptions of the different medicinal drugs, the manner of preparing them when known, and the marks indicative of their purity or impurity. With this neceſſary addition, and ſome directions and explanations reſpecting the characters and jargon in which medical preſcriptions are uſually preſented to the apothecary, we would recommend theſe volumes as not only a uſeful but a neceſſary appendage to the deſk of every vender of drugs throughout the United Kingdom. We acknowledge, however, that theſe volumes exhibit many excellent ſpecimens of analytical illuſtrations; that they preſerve a proper medium between mere nomenclature explanations and tedious hiſtories of the different ſubjects; that they are perſpicuous, conciſe, ſatisfactory, and ſufficiently copious, although copiouſneſs of terms is one of the moſt rare qualifications of moſt modern dictionaries of ſcience. Every article, indeed, beſides its derivative ſignification, is neatly and accurately drawn up, and ſeveral of the pharmaceutical ſubjects are treated in a manner which proves the authors to be very well acquainted with ſome of the more abſtruſe chemical phenomena. Dr. Thomſon, however, is a much better authority than Accum; and Drs. Cogan and Falconer than Dr. Willich. The work, indeed, as the authors obſerve in their preface, is wholly modern, and, diveſted of the ancient *verbiage* about the temperaments, which convey no diſtinct knowledge, it embraces all the late diſcoveries and moſt approved practice of the ableſt phyſicians of the laſt thirty or forty years. The ſhort, but inte-

reſting and ſcientific biographical notices are highly honourable to the authors, as they evince them to be actuated by an honeſt regard to the fair fame of thoſe great men, whoſe labours and diſcoveries have conferred permanent advantages on all ſucceeding generations. We cannot withhold the moſt unqualified approbation of this part of our authors' plan, and recommend it for general adoption, in preference to the unphiloſophical mode of commemorating diſcoveries by an abſurd application of their arbitrary names to the natural objects diſcovered. It is in this manner that the progreſs of ſcience is connected with the life of man, and both are contemplated with relation to the intereſts of ſociety. With equal applauſe we muſt notice the wiſdom of rejecting all accounts of inoculation, but only with the vaccine pox: were this excluſive plan generally adopted, the enemies of children would ſoon ceaſe to exiſt. In a word, this Dictionary, illuſtrated by numerous well executed plates, muſt tend to diminiſh the temerity of the preſumptuous empiric, by preſenting him with a general and luminous view of that multifarious ſcience which he ignorantly dares to profeſs, while it will ſerve as a faithful tablet of memory to every regular practitioner, whoſe greateſt pleaſure conſiſts in the ſpeedy recovery or alleviation of his patients. The general want of ſuch a comprehenſive work is a preſumptive proof of its utility.

A Permanent and Effectual Remedy ſuggeſted for the Evils under which the Britiſh Weſt Indies now labour; in a Letter from a Weſt India Merchant to a Weſt India Planter. 8vo. Pp. 45. Richardſon. 1807.

IN the preſent diſtreſſed ſituation of the Weſt India planters, various meaſures have been ſuggeſted for their relief. The writer of the pamphlet before us, aware of the impediments, ariſing either from our political relations with foreign powers, or from financial conſiderations, to any effectual relief being given them by his Majeſty's miniſters, recommends a meaſure, the adoption of which depends upon themſelves alone, and which, in the nature of things, cannot fail of producing the deſired effect. He aſſumes it as a poſition, that the real cauſe of the preſent diſtreſſed ſtate of the ſugar market, is, that the quantity imported exceeds the conſumption of the United Kingdoms; and that for the ſurplus quantity, which muſt neceſſarily be exported, ſuch a price only can be obtained as is ruinous to the planter. The cauſe of his being in this ſituation is thus accounted for:

"The original intention of the Britiſh Weſt India planter was to grow ſugar for the conſumption of Great Britain and Ireland; and the quantity produced ſo nearly met the conſumption, that, antecedent to 1791, the exportation rarely exceeded 12,000 hogſheads per annum. From that period, the deſtruction of St. Domingo occaſioned a demand of ſugar in our markets, for the ſupply of France and the continent; the prices of courſe advanced with that new demand, and the Britiſh planters extended their cultivation to meet it. Many of them were tempted, not only to exert all the ſtrength of their eſtates to the production of ſugar, but to expend large ſums of money in hired negro labour for the ſame purpoſe; they abandoned in many inſtances the ſyſtem of raiſing proviſions, as they found that they were able, by the high price they obtained for ſugar, to purchaſe proviſions at a cheaper rate than the value of the land and negro labour, which muſt otherwiſe have been employed to raiſe them. Theſe, and other cauſes, have tended to increaſe, in a very extraordinary manner, the quantity of ſugar produced in the Britiſh colonies, as well as the expences at which the eſtates were formerly conducted. The advantage of producing that increaſed quantity of ſugar has entirely ceaſed, while the additional expences incurred have continued. The market for which the increaſed quantity was produced has eſcaped from our command, or is ſupplied from a ſource, the current from which we cannot or do not impede."

From the conſideration of theſe facts he urges the planters to revert to their former ſyſtem, and confine the growth of ſugar to the conſumption of the mother country, as the only remedy for the evils under which they labour. In ſupport of this ſyſtem, he compares the price formerly paid the planter for his ſugar, excluſive of charges, with that now paid him; and ſhews, that at the preſent price he ſuſtains an annual loſs of 195*l* on an eſtate making 300 hhds. of ſugar, without any return of intereſt on his capital; which eſtate, making only 200 hhds., gave him, at the former price, an annual income of 3845*l* 16*s* 8*d*. That the meaſure which he recommends may be carried into full effect, he adviſes the planters ſo to conduct their eſtates, that every article of proviſion requiſite for the conſumption of the white people, the negroes, and the ſtock, ſhall be raiſed upon them, and not purchaſed. He eſtimates the diminution of the quantity of produce that would take place if this ſyſtem were adopted, including that which muſt neceſſarily follow the abolition of the ſlave trade, at nearly one-third of the preſent growth; and thus, he ſays, "that remedy we have ſo long been ſeeking for, a glutted market, will be immediately found."

That this will be the only reſource of the Britiſh Weſt India planter, if the preſent intercourſe between the United

States of America and the colonies of the enemy continues, is well exemplified in the following paſſage.

" At this moment the foreign merchant writes to his correſpondent in Great Britain, ' Ship me ſugar at 32*s* on board, for with the ' expences of its conveyance I cannot afford to pay more, ſo as to ' be able in any way to meet the price of the colonial produce ' brought by the American carrier to the continent.' Of what uſe, therefore, is it to the Britiſh planter to grow ſugar for a market which can only now afford him 32*s* for an article for which he ought to obtain 65*s* 6*d*, if he is paid the coſt of producing and tranſporting it to the place of ſale, and expects any adequate return for his labour and capital?"

This writer predicts, from the abolition of the ſlave trade by this country, and from the recent confederation upon the Continent, the fundamental principle of which is the excluſion of Britiſh manufactures and produce, that our Weſt India planters have no favourable change to expect at a peace: but no treaty of peace ought ever to be concluded, which would leave the commercial and colonial intereſts of this country abandoned to ſuch a combination. The want of commercial proviſions was the overſight committed by Lord Sidmouth in the treaty of Amiens; and the reſult of that peace of experiment, as it was properly termed, ought to prevent any future repetition of the ſame error. As the war is a commercial war, ſo ſhould the peace be a commercial peace; and we truſt no miniſter will again negotiate without keeping this principle in view; or conclude a treaty which does not ſtipulate, in the good old form, that Great Britain ſhall enjoy all the rights, privileges, and exemptions in trade, navigation, and commerce, which are allowed to the moſt favoured nations.

Our author is aware that his ſyſtem will be attended with a diminution of the carrying trade, and propoſes ſupplying, in ſome degree, the deficiency occaſioned by the reduced quantity of ſugar, by an increaſed importation of rum. To accompliſh this object, he recommends the total prohibition of foreign brandy, which would encourage the conſumption of rum, and induce the planter to ſhip it to the mother country, in exchange for the produce of the Britiſh fiſheries, or of Britiſh agriculture, exported in Britiſh veſſels, inſtead of being, as it now is, bartered at a great depreciation, for the produce of America, tranſported in American veſſels. He remarks that the pilchard fiſhery is totally ruined by the interruption of our intercourſe with Spain and Italy; and that as recent experiments have proved that pilchards can be

ſo cured as to keep perfectly well to the Weſt Indies, where they are highly approved of as an article of food for negroes, this fiſhery in particular might be eſtabliſhed, and the Britiſh herring fiſhery be much extended, if the planters were enabled to pay for their ſupplies by the proceeds of their rum, which will now ſcarcely reimburſe the coſt of conveyance to Great Britain, in conſequence of the encouragement given to foreign brandy, by granting licenſes to import it in neutral bottoms.

Some pertinent obſervations follow, on the value of the colonial trade to the mother country. As our author juſtly remarks, it is the only trade which this country can abſolutely command, independent of all non-importation acts, or prohibitory decrees of foreign powers; and the navy is more indebted to it for its creation and maintenance, than to any other commerce carried on by this kingdom.

The appendix to this pamphlet contains various ſtatements, founded on official documents, of the importation, the exportation, the conſumption, and the price of ſugar, at different periods; which prove the preſent diſtreſs of the planter, the diſproportion between the importation and the home conſumption, and illuſtrate the expediency of the meaſure ſuggeſted.

The writer of this letter is evidently well acquainted with the ſubject of which he treats; and the remedy which he propoſes is at once ſimple and efficacious. If the preſent calamitous ſituation of the Britiſh Weſt India planters ſhould continue much longer, this remedy will be forced upon the patients to whom it is preſcribed. We truſt, however, that the wiſdom of his Majeſty's miniſters will deviſe more ſuitable expedients for their relief, and not reduce them to the neceſſity of reſorting to a ſyſtem which would materially injure our commercial and manufacturing intereſts, and by diminiſhing our nurſery for ſeamen, weaken that navy which is the great bulwark of the Britiſh empire.

POLITICS.

Thoughts on the Preſent Criſis of our Domeſtic Affairs. By another Lawyer. 8vo. Pp. 59. Hatchard. 1807.

IT was ſaid of ſomebody, that if he had not wit himſelf, he was the cauſe of it in others; ſo it may be ſaid of the late miniſters, that if they had no talents themſelves (which, however, be it far from

us to aſſert), they have been the cauſe of many talents in others, at leaſt the cauſe of the diſplay of them. This author is a ſound lawyer of the old ſchool, who looks for the conſtitution, where only it is to be found, in our ſtatute books, and ſimilar repoſitories of the laws of the land. He here takes a brief but correct view of the conduct of the late miniſtry, and of the cauſe of their diſmiſſion, upon which his ſentiments are juſt, and his arguments ſound.

"Strange to tell, they wrecked their gorgeous galleon on the ſame rock that had proved fatal to the bark of their predeceſſors, in 1801. The ROMAN CATHOLIC *queſtion* ruined both; ſo fatal has this queſtion proved to ſtateſmen in every period of our eventful annals. The King's reign has been one act of conceſſion to the Roman Catholics of Ireland; yet they are not ſatisfied. They poſſeſs, from theſe conceſſions, every privilege except *power;* but *power* is exactly that enjoyment which no one can claim as *a matter of right*. And the Roman Catholics of Ireland are not perſecuted; they are themſelves the only perſecutors, by the perſeverance of their ſtruggles for power."

This is ſtrictly true; the only perſons perſecuted in Ireland are the Proteſtants, who, in thoſe diſtricts where the Romaniſts abound, are expoſed to every ſpecies of injury and inſult; ſo much ſo, in ſome parts, as to be under the abſolute neceſſity of leaving the country. The author, obſerving on the tolerant ſpirit of the KING, as diſplayed in his bounty to the late Cardinal York, adds another inſtance of his benevolent diſpoſition not generally known.

"The Roman Catholics of Scotland, amounting perhaps to five and twenty thouſand, as they are all poor, are quite unable to maintain their clergy. This calamitous circumſtance being repreſented to the King, his Majeſty, in the true ſpirit of the Goſpel, ſettled 100*l* a year on each of their biſhops, and 25*l* on each of their prieſts. This noble inſtance of Goſpel charity is ſcarcely known, becauſe charity boaſteth not; charity letteth not the left hand know what the right hand doeth. Theſe two examples are demonſtrations, like proofs of *holy writ*, of the beneficent temper of the King as to his Roman Catholic ſubjects."

Remarking on Lord Howick's bill, which went to open both the army and navy to perſons of all religions, and to perſons of none, he quotes an inſtance of a different ſpirit about the period of that revolution, which was uniformly the ſubject of his lordſhip's annual commemoration, until he came into power.

"The army and navy both revolted againſt King James II, when in purſuit of the projects of Popery. The army on Hounſlow Heath broke out into a tumult of joy when they heard of the acquittal of the ſeven biſhops. In 1687 Admiral Strickland, who was a Papiſt, having directed the prieſts to ſay maſs on board his ſhip, the ſeamen, a claſs not famous for attention to religious controverſy, roſe in a mutiny, and inſiſted to throw [on throwing] the prieſts overboard. Strickland proceeded to ſeverity: the ſeverity added rage to mutiny, and both theſe terrible paſſions flew from ſhip to ſhip. The

King was obliged to repair to Portſmouth to pacify the ſeamen. His Majeſty in vain called them his children and old friends: it was impoſſible to ſatisfy them until the prieſts were removed from all the ſhips.—*Nereſby's Memoirs*, 865."

Here *hiſtorical fact* is oppoſed to *political ſpeculation*; and in the following paſſage, *legal precedent* is oppoſed to *illegal practice*.

"Precedents have been quoted on this occaſion; here is a precedent worth a thouſand ſuch: by the wiſe ſtateſmen who governed this nation in 1756, an act was carried through, for enabling the King to employ in America a certain number of foreign *Proteſtant* officers; yet however urgent the occaſion, the law required of ſuch Proteſtant officers, before they received their commiſſions, that they ſhould produce a certificate of their having taken the ſacrament in ſome Proteſtant and Reformed congregation.—29 Geo. II, ch. v."

And yet have we been called upon to depart from the wiſe policy of our anceſtors, merely to gratify the turbulent ſpirit of a few ambitious individuals.

A Key to the recent Conduct of the Emperor of Ruſſia. 8vo. Pp. 68. Jordan and Maxwell. 1807.

THE author, who writes with great impartiality and good ſenſe, imputes the conduct of the Imperial Alexander, in concluding the treaty of Tilſit, to his diſguſt at the treatment which he experienced from the late miniſters. That treatment is here detailed much at length, and cenſured with great, but merited, ſeverity. We concur with him in moſt of his ſentiments, but ſtill we think it impoſſible to juſtify the conduct of Alexander, when we compare the treaty of Tilſit with his manifeſto on the commencement of hoſtilities; but we muſt defer our diſcuſſion of this ſubject to a future opportunity. After ſtating, and correctly, we believe, the imputed grounds of offence which "all the Talents" had given to the Emperor, he adds—

"Let us, therefore, thank ourſelves for all that has happened. And if Napoleon have a grain of common gratitude in him, he will erect a golden ſtatue to the late 'Conſtellation,' which proved ſo propitious to his intereſts, and ſmiled ſo benignantly on his ſucceſſes!"

On the reſpect due to crowned heads, generally ſpeaking, the author's notions are perfectly accurate; but in his wiſhes to impoſe reſtrictions on the preſs, by reſtraining all comments on the conduct of foreign potentates, it is impoſſible for us to agree with him. Buonaparte, in particular, is a creature *ſui generis*; a being in whom ſin, vice, and infamy, are perſonified: and to call upon us to forbear all animadverſions on his crimes, is to endeavour to deprive, not only the preſent age, but poſterity, of one of the moſt uſeful leſſons which could be derived from hiſtory. How can the author venture to ſay that this deteſtable uſurper "furniſhes us with a leſſon of *moderation* in language?" Has he never read his proclamations, his manifeſtoes, and his bulletins? Did Buonaparte never "*inſult*" the En-

peror of Ruſſia, the King of Pruſſia, and the King of Sweden?—Surely he muſt have drunk deep of the waters of Lethe! His remarks on the American diſpute are very far from juſt, and their tendency is to diſpirit the nation, and to lead them to ſubmit to the moſt degrading inſults, and to the moſt deſtructive injuries. His concluding obſervations, however, are manly, ſpirited, and correct; and the whole pamphlet is well worthy of peruſal.

An Important and Infallible Secret, diſcovered and developed in the Laws of Human Nature, to render the Valour of Britiſh Soldiers and the Freedom of Britiſh Citizens invincible. Addreſſed to the Britiſh and American Nations. 8vo. Pp. 64. 2s. Egerton. 1807.

AS far as we can underſtand the author's reaſoning and meaning, his infallible ſpecific for rendering us infallible, as ſoldiers and as citizens, is to confine our military operations to the uſe of the bayonet, and to the attack en maſſe, or in a compact and united body; and to form an aſſociation of the landed intereſt for the purpoſe of giving a tone to the country. His principles are evidently patriotic, and his intentions highly laudable; though his language is not the moſt perſpicuous or intelligible, as may be ſeen from the following brief ſpecimen.

"The inſatiable ambition of the continental tyrant has taught his ſoldiers, to make them brave, that death is an eternal ſleep; but improved reaſon and Britiſh philoſophy demonſtrate to Britiſh ſoldiers that matter, or real entity, can neither have ſleep nor death; and that the human mode or form of body, diſſolving the ſingle identity of a ſoldier, diſperſes and recombines its indeſtructible atoms into the prince he ſerved, the general he followed, and the officer he obeyed, and all ſurrounding nature; ſo that the Britiſh hero who dies in the field to oppoſe evil, which may diſturb for ages the repoſe of the ſenſitive ſyſtem, the ſame indeſtructible atoms revive in a meliorated ſtate of multiplied exiſtence, to receive the good of their own previous agency, in an incalculable ratio of retributive intereſt."

This favours a little of the doctrine of tranſmigration; but no matter. If we miſtake not, we here recognize the ſtyle of an occaſional correſpondent, whoſe generous ſoul, ſuperior to all ſelfiſh feelings, delights in communicating comfort and happineſs to all who ſtand in need of them.

The author, by way of proving the excellence of his ſyſtem, adviſes that the commanders of our frigates ſhould be inſtructed, whenever they meet with an enemy's ſhip of the line, to run along ſide and immediately board her, in which caſe he doubts not the pre-eminent merit of his "*diſcipline of ſympathy*" would be fully demonſtrated. But we wiſh him to conſider whether the frigate would not be expoſed to the ſame diſaſter which befell the Dublin privateer, which, in attempting to board a French frigate, was ſunk by her ſuperior weight of metal.

Preſent State of the Britiſh Conſtitution, hiſtorically illuſtrated. By Britannicus. Pp. 182. 8vo. Longman and Co. 1807.

IF Britannicus thinks that a few garbled extracts from Robertſon, Millar, Hume, Monteſquieu, and Tacitus, can illuſtrate the *preſent* ſtate of the Britiſh conſtitution, we fear he is as little acquainted with the ſucceſſion of time, as with the political principles he wiſhes to *illuſtrate.* Very few pages of this pamphlet are devoted to modern affairs; but theſe few are quite ſufficient to develop, if not the author's principles, at leaſt his *views*, in compiling this work. Weak as he muſt be, we would not be ſurpriſed if this tract had procured him the *promiſe* of being one day or other ſent ambaſſador to a northern empire, where he might diſplay his ſtupendous talents either as a political dancing-maſter or a bear-hunter. It would be a waſte of time and of our pages to occupy them with this work, yet we could not help ſmiling when the writer gravely makes it out a *crime* in his Majeſty to have exerciſed his *own* will in diſmiſſing his late miniſters!!! But then he inſiſts that his Majeſty *muſt* have had adviſers. Well, and ſuppoſe any of thoſe perſons who had previouſly *ſworn* to adviſe their ſovereign on all occaſions to the beſt of their belief and judgment had in this caſe communicated their opinions to him, was it not a *duty* they owed their own conſcience as well as their king and country? In general, the late miniſters and their partizans ſeem to conſider the *oath* of a cabinet miniſter, whether to ſecrecy or fidelity, no longer binding than they remained in the royal chamber. This monſtrous doctrine, the very worſt of the worſt wretches on earth, is too horrible to be coolly contemplated; ſuch villanous ſentiments ſhould be ſunk into oblivion under the preſſure of their own infamy. But, it is falſe that his Majeſty acted by any other counſel than the genuine dictates of his own acute mind and unſullied conſcience; and it is equally erroneous to conclude, as Britannicus ſtupidly does, that in doing ſo he violated the principle, that the King can do no wrong. Such ridiculous effuſions are beneath contempt.

AGRICULTURE.

Obſervations reſpecting the Grub; a Paper read to the Holderneſs Agricultural Society. Second Edition. By William Stickney, of Ridgemont, in Holderneſs, and publiſhed by the Society. 8vo. Pp. 22. 1s 6d. Harding. 1806.

EVERY information reſpecting this deſtructive inſect cannot fail to be highly intereſting to farmers; and it is the duty of all who intereſt themſelves in the improvement of agriculture,—and every one ought ſo to intereſt himſelf,—to communicate the reſult of his obſervations to the public. Mr. Stickney's remarks, which ſeem to have

been made with great attention and accuracy, have led him to conclude that the grub is chiefly found in clover ſtubbles, or *clover leys*, as they are more generally termed, and, conſequently, that wheat ſown after clover is more likely to be injured by it, than if ſown after a fallow, or after any other crop. This perfectly correſponds with our own obſervations. No remedy is ſuggeſted, and lime, which might naturally be ſuppoſed ſufficient to deſtroy the grub, or at leaſt ſo to annoy it, as to drive it away, has been proved to produce no ſuch effect. Mr. Stickney recommends early ploughing after clover, as the moſt likely means to prevent injury from the grub, by affording time to the wheat to acquire ſtrength, before it becomes ſubject to its attacks.

On the Improvement of poor Soils; read in the Holderneſs Agricultural Society, in Anſwer to the following Queſtion: "What is the beſt Method of Cultivating and Improving poor Soils, where Lime and Manure cannot be had?" with an Appendix and Notes. Second Edition. By John Alderſon, M. D. 8vo. Pp. 34. 2s. Harding. 1807.

THIS uſeful little tract was duly noticed in this Review on its firſt appearance. The ſuggeſtions of its author for the improvement of poor ſoils without the aid of manure are judicious; but the theory which the Doctor has formed, with a view to account for the failure of attempts to grow ſucceſſive crops of the ſame plants on the ſame land, appears to us more fanciful than ſolid. It is a fact, however, not to be controverted, that in nine hundred and ninety-nine caſes out of a thouſand, ſuch attempts will fail; nay, it is even certain, that the ſeed of wheat taken from a clay ſoil will not grow again upon a clay ſoil (in a different field) ſo well as upon a ſoil of a different nature.

DIVINITY.

Divine Service for the Camp or Garriſon, as performed at the Drum-Head; with the Outlines of a few Diſcourſes, or Field Sermons, adapted to the Underſtanding and Circumſtances of the Private Soldier. To which is annexed a Sketch of the Form of Conſecration of a Stand of Colours. By the Reverend William Henry Pratt, Rector of Joneſborough, &c. &c. 8vo. Pp. 40. Aſperne. 1807.

IN his preface Mr. Pratt offers ſome rational obſervations on the importance of the office of regimental chaplain, which was ſuppreſſed not long ſince, from a miſtaken principle of miſplaced economy, and which he moſt earneſtly recommends to be reſtored. Indeed, the reaſons which he aſſigns for his recommendation are perfectly ſolid, and we hope they will be attended to. His extracts from the Liturgy, and his ſhort diſcourſes, are extremely well adapted to the purpoſe of military devotion; and we have no doubt that the regiments with which he has aſſociated have derived much benefit from his inſtructions,

The Duty of Steadfaſtneſs in Church Communion; a Sermon. By [the Reverend] Edward Pearſon, B. D. Rector of Rempſtere, Nottinghamſhire. 12mo. Pp. 40. 6d.

THIS Sermon was preached and publiſhed, as the worthy author informs us, with a view of guarding his flock againſt the ſeductions of ſome Baptiſts and Methodiſts who infeſt his neighbourhood, and who ſpare no pains to allure them from his fold. It is chiefly addreſſed to thoſe men of wavering minds, who, halting "between two opinions," attend the ſervice of the church in the morning, and repair to the meeting-houſe in the evening. The folly and the ſin of ſuch conduct are very plainly and very fully ſet forth, and whatever the ſucceſs of the attempt might be, Mr. Pearſon (whoſe zeal unto knowledge is indefatigable, and under the ſtrict guidance of judgment) would enjoy the conſciouſneſs of having done his duty. In a note, Mr. P. ſays, "at a meeting-houſe in this neighbourhood, the miniſter, I am told, lately prayed, that it would pleaſe God to rain down bricks and mortar from Heaven, with which meeting-houſes might be built." One would really be led to think that ſome ſuch ſhowers had fallen in the vicinity of the metropolis of late, for theſe conventicles are increaſing beyond calculation. How long this ſcandalous abuſe of the *toleration act* will be tolerated by the legiſlature, we cannot even conjecture; but certain are we, that if it be not ſpeedily checked, religion will ſuſtain the moſt ſerious injury.

The Duties of the Sick ſtated and enforced. By Thomas Secker, LL. D. late Lord Archbiſhop of Canterbury. A new Edition, with a Preface, a few Variations, and Additions. By [the Rev.] Thos. Stevens, D. D. Rector of Paufield, Eſſex. 12mo. Pp. 68. Rivingtons. 1807.

DR. Stevens has rendered an acceptable ſervice to the Chriſtian world, by reducing into a form better calculated for general circulation, the excellent admonitions and inſtructions of Archbiſhop Secker, for Sick Perſons. Nothing can be better calculated to impreſs ſick perſons with a juſt ſenſe of their awful ſituation, or to explain to them the very ſerious and important duties which they have to perform.

MEDICINE.

The Phyſician's Vade Mecum; being a Compendium of Noſology and Therapeutics, for the Uſe of Students. By the Rev. Joſeph Townſend, Rector of Pewſey, Wilts. Tenth Edition. Small 8vo. Pp. 166. 4s. Symonds. 1807.

AN improved and even elegant edition of one of our moſt uſeful compendiums for the daily uſe of medical profeſſors. It is introduced by ſome very judicious obſervations addreſſed to young practitioners on the neceſſity of accurately diſcriminating the different

ſymptoms, and determining the particular ſpecies and cauſe of diſeaſe under which their patient labours. This is not only a very convenient, but alſo a very ſafe book, as there is no danger of its inducing the *unlearned* to begin to adminiſter medicines with the nature of which they are wholly unacquainted.

A Letter to the Right Hon. Spencer Perceval, Chancellor of the Exchequer, &c. on the Expediency and Propriety of regulating, by Parliamentary Authority, the Practice of Variolous Inoculation, with a View to the Extermination of the Small-Pox. Pp. 36. 8vo. Hatchard. 1807.

THE practicability of totally annihilating the ſmall-pox by means of vaccination has not yet been ſufficiently contemplated. The gentleman who thus addreſſes the Chancellor of the Exchequer appears duly impreſſed with the importance of the ſubject, and modeſtly propoſes that an effectual ſtop ſhould be put to variolous inoculation, by ſubſtituting vaccination inſtead of it. For this purpoſe he obſerves, that the vaccine inſtitutions ſhould be ſupported by government, in order that the poor might be vaccinated *gratis*. This propoſal is the more palatable, that, if the project ſucceeds (and from the rapid progreſs of vaccination in *all* foreign countries, we cannot doubt that it will), ſuch inſtitutions could not be very many years *neceſſary*, as were the variolous contagion known to be once totally extinguiſhed during ſeven years in Europe, it would not *then* ſurely be neceſſary to continue the vaccine preventive. This writer, whoſe patriotiſm, benevolence, and legal knowledge, are equally conſpicuous in the Letter before us, quotes a number of ancient laws for the preſervation of his Majeſty's ſubjects from contagion, and thinks that the legiſlature ſhould enforce, in a ſimilar manner, the means of preſervation from variolous infection. "That variolous inoculation," ſays he, "ſhould now be *prohibited* by legiſlative authority, might, perhaps, ſtartle the prejudices of a jealous liberty, though it would convey no terror to the *reaſoning* mind." True; but we truſt the *good ſenſe* of the Engliſh public, and the *honeſty* of medical profeſſors, will render ſuch a meaſure unneceſſary: ſhould theſe fail, however, we ſee no reaſon why legiſlative wiſdom ſhould not interfere to put a final ſtop to this ſpecies of *manſlaughter*, if not in ſome caſes actual *murder!* We would recommend this very judicious and learned Letter to all legiſlators and medical practitioners, as well as the miniſter to whom it is addreſſed. It is alſo an indirect but a very cogent appeal to the Royal Colleges of Phyſicians and Surgeons, to exerciſe their prerogatives, and fulfil their duty to ſociety, in ſubſtituting vaccine for variolous inoculation throughout their juriſdiction; and now that the ſuperiority and efficacy of vaccination are eſtabliſhed beyond all reaſonable doubt, theſe corporate bodies have it in their power to make it a *ſine qua non* of admiſſion into their privileged communities.

The public, we underſtand, are indebted for this very able Letter to Sir Codrington Edmund Carrington, Knt., late Chief Juſtice of Ceylon.

EDUCATION.

A Guide to Uſeful Knowledge; or the Elements of Aſtronomy, Geography, Natural Philoſophy, Mythology, and Hiſtory. Deſigned for the Uſe of Schools. Fourth edition. 18mo. Pp. 187. 2s 6d bound. Booſey. 1807.

THE three preceding editions of this excellent little book were, we underſtand, uſed in the author's own academy at Kennington; and the preſent, although the fourth, is only the firſt that has been laid before the public. As a juvenile introduction to aſtronomy, geography, hiſtory, and chronology, ſacred and profane, we believe it ſuperior to any ſimilar production extant in the Engliſh language. The poetical illuſtrations of the twelve ſigns of the zodiac, as indicative of the ſeaſon; and the explanations of the conſtellations, with the rapid ſketch of the celeſtial bodies, are admirably calculated to inſpire young minds with reverential awe for the incomprehenſibly Great Power which governs ſuch immenſe worlds. The brief geographical accounts of the different nations of the earth, with the articles of commerce which they produce; the enumeration of the chief rivers of theſe countries, their ſeas, ſtraits, gulphs, bays, channels, and lakes, all are conciſely and accurately brought under the eye of the pupil. The ſketch of natural philoſophy, indeed, is very antiquated. Mr. Keegan ſhould not have continued to follow Derham in his nitrous and ſulphureous particles in the atmoſphere; ſuch notions are now exploded as erroneous on the cleareſt evidence. The comparative chronology of ſacred and profane hiſtory, however, is equally judicious and uſeful; and the hiſtory of the Bible, contraſted with that of Greece and Rome, will be ſingularly convenient to boys who begin to read Juſtin, or any other claſſic hiſtorian, in which they are frequently at a loſs to know how many years have elapſed ſince the event therein detailed. Upon the whole, it is truly an intereſting "Guide to Uſeful Knowledge."

The Preceptor and his Pupils; or, Dialogues, Examinations, and Exerciſes on Grammar in general, and the Engliſh Grammar in particular. For the Uſe of Schools and private Students. By George Crabb, Maſter of the Commercial and Literary Seminary [Walworth]. Pp. 210. 12mo. 3s 6d. Booſey. 1807.

THOSE who think we are already poſſeſſed of the beſt means of communicating grammatical knowledge to children, know little of the human mind; and thoſe who conſider every deviation from the common methods either erroneous or criminal, are equally as incompetent judges. Mr. Crabb has thrown the rules and illuſtrations of grammar into the natural form of a dialogue between the maſter and his pupils; in other words, he has given the queſtions of the maſter and the anſwers of the ſcholar. His "grand aim," he ſays, "has been to eſtabliſh in the minds of learners a clear and poſitive *diſtinc-*

tion between *words* and *things*; keeping at the ſame time in view their neceſſary dependence on, and connection with, each other." This he has effected; and we are certain that thoſe young perſons who know nothing of the general forms of grammar, will ſooner acquire a knowledge of that neceſſary but ſomewhat difficult ſcience in the manner here adopted, than by haraſſing their memories with the recollection of diſtinctions and terms, which to their weak comprehenſion are the ſame as arbitrary. We would, therefore, recommend the peruſal of Mr. C.'s catechetical grammar to all thoſe young men in counting-houſes, or other buſineſs-ſituations, who wiſh to ſpell and write their mother tongue correctly.

POETRY.

Pros and Cons for Cupid and Hymen; in a Series of Metrical Satiric Dialogues, exhibiting the Horrors and Delights of being over Head and Ears in Love; with the ſupreme Felicity and Wretchedneſs of Matrimony. To which are added, ſeveral other Pieces. By Jenkin Jones, Author of "Hobby Horſes," "The Philanthropiſt," &c. Pp. 292. 12mo. 7s (with a coloured ſatirical caricature). Allen. 1807.

MR. Jones has the art of blending good moral precepts with poignant ſatire and much broad humour, which renders his poetry at once agreeable and inſtructive. Had he thought proper to give a proof of *practice* betraying *principles*, and publiſhed each of his *nine* Dialogues, in the Wigmore-ſtreet ſtyle, at a dollar each, we doubt not that his publiſher might ſhortly have uſed a new title-page, exhibiting the *tenth* edition! This, the literary hero of the Eclipſe and Inveſtigation would contend, was a proof that honeſty is not *always* the beſt policy. Be it ſo; a newſpaper repentance, an Iriſh hug, or a police exhibition, may, perhaps, acidify the ſweets of deception and calumny. Our author's ſatire, however, has a much wider field, and exhibits a moſt obſervant and benevolent mind, intimately acquainted with mankind in various countries and ſituations. Few perſons will read this good-natured ſatiriſt's verſes without forming more juſt conceptions of the real pleaſures and pains of human life.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The Caitiff of Corſica, or the Univerſal Banditto. An Hiſtorical Drama, in Five Acts; exhibiting the Characters, Moral and Political, of the principal Perſonages throughout the French Revolution; with their Portraits reduced from the Original Oil Painting in the Muſeum at Paris. Pp. 284. 8vo. 7s 6d. Budd. 1807.

A BRIEF but faithful hiſtory of Buonaparte and his atrocious aſſociates from the beginning of the revolution to his becoming an Emperor. A very intereſting ſketch of all the revolutionary monſters

are given as a preface to this excellent drama, the firſt act of which ends with the death of the King, the ſecond the maſſacre in Paris, third in Italy, fourth in Egypt, and the laſt concludes with the coronation. The true character of Buonaparte is happily ſeized, always affecting innocence and humanity at the very time that he is meditating the ſouleſt crimes. To thoſe who wiſh to have a ſhort ſketch of the enormities of the French, without entering too deeply into their odious abominations, this dramatic hiſtory will be a moſt acceptable preſent. In the words of our author, the drama before us, "with the portraits of the characters, taken from original drawings, exhibits them in body and ſoul, as in the mirror of nature." As a picture, and not an exaggerated one, it muſt excite the moſt ſerious reflections on human nature.

Croſby's Farmers, Graziers, Stewards, Bailiffs, and Cattle-Keepers Pocket-Book, for 1808. *To be continued Annually.* Pp. 176, 8vo. Croſby and Co.

A VERY neceſſary and uſeful book, replete with curious and important agricultural and legal information to all perſons who devote their attention to agriculture, keep elegant country reſidences, or who may occaſionally exerciſe themſelves with rural ſports. Independent of the intelligence it contains, the uſe of the tables will induce habits of order and regularity in the management of buſineſs.

REVIEWERS REVIEWED.

DR. STEUART'S SALLUST; MEMOIRS OF LORD KAMES; DR. THOMSON'S SYSTEM OF CHEMISTRY; AND THE ECLECTIC AND EDINBURGH REVIEWERS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ANTI-JACOBIN REVIEW AND MAGAZINE.

Sir,

IN your Review for December laſt I read with much ſatisfaction your chaſtiſement of the Eclectic reviewer of Dr. Steuart's tranſlation of Salluſt; and have looked with ſome degree of anxiety and diſappointment for the continuation which you promiſed of that article. Perhaps it has been continued; for, owing to reaſons with which the public has no concern, I have not had the good fortune to ſee one number of your Journal theſe three months. Should the caſe, however, be otherwiſe, perhaps the following facts and obſervations may contribute ſomething towards realizing the hope which you expreſs (p. 434), as well as towards expoſing the motives of the Eclectic critic's virulence.

You drew a compariſon between that gentleman and the Edinburgh reviewers, which is by no means favourable to the talents of

the former; while you allow the writers in both journals to be influenced by the ſame motives, and to have in view the ſame objects. I am not ſure that in this compariſon you have dealt juſtly by the Eclectics. The Eclectic Review is publiſhed by LONGMAN, HURST, REES, and Co.; and the Edinburgh Review by CONSTABLE, who is known to be very cloſely connected with theſe bookſellers. It is therefore poſſible, I think even probable, that the ſame men may occaſionally write for both journals; and that when it is reſolved in the critical divan to damn the work of an author of too much conſequence to be traduced in the Edinburgh Review, which is conducted by a ſet of men who are not only all known, but all dependent in ſome degree on the public, as practitioners in law, phyſic, or divinity, the Eclectic may be choſen as the ſafer vehicle of that abuſe which would otherwiſe have been poured from the Edinburgh Review. I do not indeed know that Dr. Steuart, better known, in this country, as Mr. Steuart of Allanton, has ſufficient influence either greatly to injure or greatly to promote the ſucceſs of any riſing lawyer or phyſician; but his birth and his talents certainly entitle him to ſome reſpect from the public at large. It was obſerved too, both by the friends of Mr. Steuart and of Mr. Jeffray, that a little before the publication of Salluſt, the former of theſe gentlemen began to pay *uncommon attention to the latter;* and that he has ever ſince ſpoken of the Edinburgh Review in terms of *high approbation*, which he was not wont formerly to apply to that journal.

The attention of ſuch a man as he is ſaid to be by thoſe who beſt know him, muſt be highly gratifying to every young author of a liberal mind; whilſt his approbation, loudly proclaimed, of the Edinburgh Review, muſt contribute, in ſome degree, to buoy up the gradually ſinking reputation of that journal. It is therefore poſſible, I do not ſay that it is a fact, but it is certainly poſſible, that Mr. Jeffray may have declined to review Mr. Steuart's Salluſt from motives of friendſhip and gratitude to the tranſlator. The omiſſion of ſuch a work in a journal which its authors wiſh to be "diſtinguiſhed rather for the ſelection, than for the number of its articles," and in which they profeſs to "confine their notice, in a great degree, to works that either have attained, or deſerve, a certain portion of celebrity," is an event which certainly proceeds from ſome cogent reaſons. No man of letters will conſider Dr. Steuart's two quarto volumes as a work deſtined to obſcurity, either by the inſignificance of its ſubject, or the defects of its execution. In the opinion of one of the moſt profound as well as elegant ſcholars of the age*, "Salluſtii graviſſimum opus, ſapientiâ et dignitate plenum, bene intelligere permagnum eſt aptè illuſtrari, egregium, belli vertere, admirandum." Yet of the laſt attempt to tranſlate this *graviſſimum opus*, an attempt which has been univerſally allowed to be in a high degree ſucceſsful, and to reflect greater honour on the *literature* of Scotland than any other work which, during half a century, has iſſued from

* Sir William Jones.

the preſs, no notice whatever is taken in the Edinburgh Review! If it be the determination of the proprietors and authors of that review to cenſure with ſeverity every work on which they chuſe to animadvert, as ſeems extremely probable, from the abuſe that they have indiſcriminately poured on every work of merit which has attracted their notice, the omiſſion of Steuart's Salluſt is eaſily accounted for, on the ſuppoſition at which I have hinted, and which in this city prevails almoſt univerſally among men of letters.

But though the conductor of the Edinburgh Review may have been reſtrained by the moſt honourable motives from permitting his friend to be inſulted and ridiculed in the journal which he directs, he has not probably authority ſufficient to prevent ſome of the critical divan from pouring abuſe on that friend through the medium of the Eclectic Review. Nay, it has even been ſuppoſed in this city that the article in the Eclectic Review, on which you have animadverted, was written for the Edinburgh Review, and that, when it was rejected by the conductor, it was with his conſent underſtood, if not expreſſed, tranſmitted to the editors of the Eclectic, that the precious morſel of criticiſm might not be loſt to the public!

Something ſimilar to this, it is ſuppoſed, has lately taken place with reſpect to *The Memoirs of Lord Kames*. That work has been highly and deſervedly praiſed in the Monthly and Critical Reviews; in the Anti-Jacobin, and in the Britiſh Critic; but it has been moſt illiberally abuſed in the Eclectic, and paſſed over unnoticed by the Edinburgh reviewers! What can be the reaſon of this omiſſion and this abuſe? In the Edinburgh Review, Sir William Forbes's Life of Dr. Beattie was mentioned in due time, and had the honour to provoke a ſufficient quantity of inſolence from the reviewers. The Memoirs of Lord Kames have at leaſt as much merit as the life of the Profeſſor, and are calculated to give as much offence to deiſts and democrats. Why are they not held up to ridicule and ſcorn? Publications of the ſame author of much leſs importance attracted the attention of the corps, and called forth all their powers of contemptuous ſcurrility*. Has the Life of Lord Kames eſcaped becauſe the author is no longer Mr. Frazer Tytler, but *a judge*, who cannot be decently abuſed in a journal conducted by a *lawyer* at the bar? and becauſe the abuſe has, without this indecorum, been conveyed to the public through the medium of the Eclectic? If ſuch be the caſe, is it not your duty, Mr. Editor, to complete the article which you have left unfiniſhed; to point out the blunders of the Eclectic in the ſecond part of his review; and, at all events, to retract the compliments, which, at his expence, you have paid to the Edinburgh reviewers? The Edinburgh reviewers, you ſay, (p. 430) ſurpaſs the Eclectics in the art of giving intereſt to indiſcriminate abuſe, as much as the ancient Phœnicians ſurpaſſed the Greeks in the art of navigation; and again, (p. 431) his imperial Majeſty of France approaches as near to the perfections of his Satanic Majeſty as the Eclectic reviewer of Steuart's Salluſt does to the perfections of his

* See Edinburgh Review, vol. I, p. 495, &c.

elder brethren the Edinburgh reviewers. But if the facts, and inferences from facts, which I have ſtated, appear to you as they do to almoſt every man of letters in this city, you will perceive that the Eclectic reviewer of Steuart's Salluſt and ſome member of the band of Edinburgh reviewers, are, in all probability, *alter idem;* that the one therefore does not ſurpaſs the other in any perfection; that the ordinary writers in the Eclectic Review may indeed be different from the corps of Edinburgh reviewers; and that in the deliberations of the critical divan the latter claim and exerciſe a ſuperiority over the former, ſo as occaſionally to make their journal the vehicle of ſuch abuſe, as, from conſiderations of private friendſhip or public decorum, they ſeem improper for their own.

I am, yours, &c.

Edinburgh, Aug. 3, 1807. OBSERVATOR.

THE reader will readily believe that we feel pleaſure in knowing that a man, ſo capable as Obſervator appears to be, of eſtimating literary merit, takes an intereſt in our diſcuſſions on literary ſubjects. Such men it is not our wiſh to diſappoint, by leaving any thing that appears of importance unfiniſhed; nor would the defence of Dr. Steuart's Salluſt againſt the abſurd and illiberal attacks of the Eclectic reviewers have been left incomplete, but from a conviction, formed as we proceeded with the diſguſting taſk, that their impotence was ſuch as to render them almoſt too contemptible for ſerious notice. If, however, it be true, as Obſervator alleges, that Dr. Steuart, about the period of the publication of his work, began to pay uncommon attention to the conductor of the Edinburgh Review; and much more, if he have, ſince that period, ſpoken of the Edinburgh Review in terms of *high approbation*, he cannot be himſelf diſappointed at our not completing our defence of his work againſt critics, who are certainly in alliance with the Edinburgh reviewers.

But we muſt take the liberty to inform our reſpectable correſpondent, that we cannot give credit to all the facts and inferences which he ſays are ſo generally admitted in Edinburgh. Dr. Steuart *may* certainly have formed an acquaintance, nay, a friendſhip, with the conductor of the Edinburgh Review about the period mentioned, without having an eye to the review of his own verſion of Salluſt; and Mr. Jeffray *may* have declined to review the work of his friend in a journal which admits not a favourable account of any work diſplaying the principles which have been diſplayed by Dr. Steuart. In all this there is nothing improbable in itſelf, or diſcreditable to either party. Friendſhips are formed daily between literary men of very different principles, political and religious; and of theſe friendſhips ſome (as between Burke and Johnſon) have been diſſolved only by the death of one of the parties. But we *do not believe* that Mr. Jeffray gave his conſent, either tacit or expreſſed, to the publiſhing, in either journal, of a torrent of ſenſeleſs and illiberal abuſe, which he had refuſed to publiſh in his own; and if we *were not morally certain* that Dr. Steuart never ſpoke ſeriouſly in terms of *high approbation* of the Edinburgh Review, we ſhould ceaſe to entertain that re-

ſpect which we now feel for him. That ſome articles in that review are ably written, and that in a few of the articles are diſplayed principles leſs unworthy of approbation than thoſe which it ſeems to be the general object of the review to inculcate on the public mind, he may have ſaid, for all this is indiſputably true; but having acceſs to know Dr. Steuart's *real opinion* of the tendency of that journal, it is impoſſible for us to believe that he can ever have ſpoken of it in terms of *high approbation*, or recommended it as *a thing which ought to be encouraged*. Attachment to his friend may make him ſilent in company where the Edinburgh Review is the topic of converſation; but no partial attachments will ever make a man of honour ſpeak differently of the ſame thing in different companies, or praiſe any where what his judgment condemns.

Whether any of the occaſional writers in the Edinburgh Review be the Eclectic reviewer of Dr. Steuart's Salluſt, is a queſtion to which we are not prepared to give ſo decided an anſwer. Our correſpondent's facts and reaſonings are certainly calculated to excite a ſlight ſuſpicion that this may be the caſe; and that ſuſpicion will acquire conſiderable ſtrength, if *the Memoirs of Lord Kames* be completely overlooked in the Edinburgh Review, and another work lately publiſhed in that city be abuſed, as Steuart's Salluſt was abuſed, by the Eclectics.

Of the tranſlation of Salluſt, ſince it has again been brought to our notice, we ſhould now continue our defence, were it of any importance to repel from a work of indiſputable merit the feeble attack of petulant ignorance. Can he be a formidable enemy who cenſures an author for *not* having done *leſs* than he promiſed to do? The title of Dr. Steuart's publication is, *The Works of Salluſt; to which are prefixed, two Eſſays on the Life, Literary Character, and Writings of the Hiſtorian; with Notes*, HISTORICAL, BIOGRAPHICAL, *and critical;* and in his preface he informs us, that "the work has a two-fold object; firſt, to endeavour to add to the ſmall number of our verſions of the pure claſſics, which an Engliſhman of taſte can read with ſatisfaction; and, ſecondly, *to throw ſome light on the civil*, and, in particular, *on the literary hiſtory of the* JULIAN *and* AUGUSTAN *ages.*"

Surely the latter of theſe objects was not, more than the former, unworthy either of the author, or of the public attention; but hear, good reader, what the *judicious* Eclectic ſays of it, (vol. II, p. 645.)

"We find in this bulky work, a large creature, of the *viviparous* kind, bringing with it a numerous offspring of lives, among which are thoſe of Le Clerc; of Xenophon; of Marcus Marcellus; of Marcus Antonius; of Marcus Porcius Cato; of Varro; of Marcus Æmilius Scaurus, both father and ſon; of Marcus Celpurnius Bibulus; of Livius Domitius; of L. Cato; of L. Domitius Ænobarbus, and Livius Druſus; and of Cæſar and Pompey, ſtrangely overgrown and out of proportion."

Is this ſimile of the *viviparous* animal genuine *wit*, or a contemptible *pun*? and could Dr. Steuart have thrown any light on the civil and literary hiſtory of the Julian and Auguſtan ages, without

giving ſome account of theſe illuſtrious Romans? To the former of theſe queſtions every reader of taſte will reply, upon his honour, *a contemptible pun*; and to the latter, every man of common ſenſe, from the philoſopher to the clown, will anſwer, that light cannot be thrown on the civil and literary hiſtory of any age, but by giving ſome account of the moſt eminent men who flouriſhed in it. Our Eclectic, however, is of a different opinion; for he aſſures us, that "all theſe narratives are unneceſſary!" Shall we waſte our own time, or the time of our readers, with a full detail of the blunders of ſuch a critic as this? No; the taſk would be tedious, irkſome, and uſeleſs; for he deſerves not to find the truth, who ſuffers himſelf to be miſled by ſuch a caviller. A ſpecimen, however, it may be proper to give of our critic's remarks on the *tranſlation*, which, he ſays, "the *ſize* of Dr. Steuart's *books*, the *ſtyle* of his *notes*, and the nature of his criticiſms, led the Eclectic corps to expect would be very diffuſe and paraphraſtical."!

That Dr. Steuart's *criticiſms*, miſunderſtood, might lead to this expectation, may be believed; but how a man, by the *ſize* of *books*, and the *ſtyle* of *hiſtorical* and *biographical notes*, ſhould be led to form *any* expectation of the nature of a *tranſlation*, which he had not read, is to us utterly inconceivable. So it was, however, though it ſeems the expectation was *not gratified*. That expectation muſt have been raiſed high indeed; for the only fault that is found in the tranſlation (and to find faults, or make them, ſeems to have been the critic's only object) is that it is diffuſe and paraphraſtical. "If the Doctor (ſays he) had ſurpriſed us by a nervous *imitation of the original*, he would have given us more pleaſure, and *merited more praiſe*."

Our own opinion of an *imitation* of Salluſt's manner in an *Engliſh verſion* has been given to the public in our review of the work which has thus provoked Eclectic acrimony. That opinion, therefore, we will not here re-ſtate; but we beg leave to contraſt with our Eclectic's opinion the following ſentiments of a critic, who is indiſputably a ſcholar, probably an eminent tranſlator himſelf, and apparently under the influence of any feeling but undue partiality to the work of Dr. Steuart.

"He (Dr. S.) profeſſes that it has been his aim in the firſt place to convey the *ſenſe* of the author; and, in the next, to attain as much compreſſion of ſtyle as appeared to him conſiſtent with the genius of our language, in a compoſition of good taſte; confeſſing, at the ſame time, that with the faſtidious critic he would rather incur the imputation of being ſometimes paraphraſtical, than be deterred from an attempt to ſeize ſomething of the beauty and vigour of the Roman writer. On theſe principles, as exemplified by Murphy, he wiſhes to be judged. *Nor is this unreaſonable.* No writer, perhaps, with the exception of Thucydides among the Greeks, and Tacitus among the Latins, requires ſomewhat of a *paraphraſtic verſion*, in order to make him *tolerable* to an Engliſh ear, more than the writer with whom the preſent tranſlator is engaged*." But we haſten to give the

* Britiſh Critic, vol. xxix, p. 247.

ſpecimen, which we have promiſed, of our Eclectic's remarks on this paraphraſtical tranſlation.

"The following juſt though *very diffuſe* and florid *paraphraſe* we quote (ſays this candid man) for its beauty and importance; but it is ſo completely different in form from the original, that we ſhall not take the trouble to *diſtinguiſh its abundant faults!*

"*Sic captus pravis*, &c. Bel. Jugurth. 1.—But if, impelled by appetite, or ſeduced by paſſion, the mind ignobly ſink under the dominion of ſenſe, vice and indolence impoſe their fetters, and habit gradually rivets them. Corruption once begun, it ſoon takes root in the heart. Our vigour relaxes; the flame of genius is extinguiſhed, and our time paſſes away without improvement. Meanwhile, the frailty of nature is ſure to be charged with the train of miſery that enſues. Thus it uſually happens: men refer miſcarriage in enterprize to any ſource rather than to their own miſconduct."

It was certainly prudent in our author not to take the trouble of diſtinguiſhing the abundant faults of this paſſage; for, we ſuſpect, he would have found that trouble inſurmountable. At leaſt, were we called upon to ſelect a paſſage in which Dr. Steuart has preſerved the form of the original as exactly as the genius of our language would permit, we ſhould have been as likely to pitch upon this "juſt" tranſlation, "diſtinguiſhed by abundant faults!" as upon any other. Whether the Eclectic's judgment or our's is moſt correct, the reader of learning and taſte will decide for himſelf; but every reader, whether learned or unlearned, will know what to think of the critic, who, after labouring through two numbers of his journal to convict the *Engliſh Salluſt* of every fault by which ſuch a work could be diſfigured, thus concludes his candid review:

"We now take leave of Dr. S., expreſſing our conviction, that his deep reſearch, his patient labour, his elegant taſte, and his various, extenſive, and accurate erudition, *will command the gratitude and eſteem of the world of letters!!*" This is ſo completely ridiculous, and at the ſame time ſo exactly in the manner of the Edinburgh reviewers, who, after pouring on Dr. Thomſon's Syſtem of Chemiſtry one continued torrent of ignorant abuſe, conclude their review with declaring that work to be *the beſt repoſitory of chemical ſcience that has yet been offered to the public*, that we confeſs the coincidence of abſurdity goes farther than our correſpondent's facts and inferences to perſuade us that this Eclectic is indeed one of the Edinburgh band, though certainly no particular friend of the conductor's.

MISCELLANIES.

TO THE EDITOR.

BUENOS AYRES.

"Experientia Docet."

Sir,

A MILITARY correſpondent is induced to obſerve, that the town of Buenos Ayres, being unfortified, might have been ſummoned to

ſurrender upon ſtipulated terms; and if ſuch propoſal had been rejected, it might have been ſignified, that, in the execution of an aſſault, the aſſailants would be compelled, if fired upon from houſes, in order to avoid being expoſed to irreſiſtible carnage, to ſet fire to the contiguous buildings, progreſſively and indiſcriminately, combuſtible materials being prepared for that purpoſe, however ruinous and deſtructive the conſequences might prove. And in caſe ſuch ſignification ſhould produce no effect, it is preſumed that abſolute neceſſity indiſpenſably required, for ſelf-preſervation, recourſe being had to that painful and afflictive extremity, which, if practicable, would at all events have been preventive, not only of the loſs of many brave officers and ſoldiers, but alſo of the diſgrace of a ſubmiſſive and obſequious ranſom being conceded. Theſe moſt important objects might have been attained if batteries had judiciouſly been raiſed in appropriate poſitions, tumultuous ſorties being ſcarcely to be apprehended, and bombs, carcaſſes, and red-hot ſhot had, previouſly to the precipitate and inconſiderate attack, been thrown into the town, ſo as to create commotion, and to cauſe conflagration, which might have been productive of ſurrendry, as generally practiſed upon ſimilar occaſions.

Why, or for what poſſible reaſon, time not being limited, the preliminary meaſure or expedient of bombardment was not actually adopted with vigour and perſeverance, as the mode of defence by the fire of ſmall-arms from barricadoed houſes, diſcipline not being requiſite, and that, too, after long preparation, could not have been foreſeen, or rather well known, is moſt certainly incomprehenſible.

VETERANUS.

OUR notions on this ſubject are perfectly concurrent with thoſe of our worthy and intelligent correſpondent. But, underſtanding that the conduct of General Whitelocke is to be rendered the ſubject of enquiry by a court-martial, and conceiving it probable that the reſult of ſuch enquiry may be moſt ſerious to its object, we have, from a principle of juſtice, cautiouſly abſtained from delivering any opinion upon an event which cannot have failed to attract our attention, in a very particular manner, in common with that of every man who loves his country, feels for her honour, and deplores her defeats.—EDITOR.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE objections to the letter of "Philanthropos" are certainly well founded; but no reader of the ANTI-JACOBIN REVIEW could, for a moment, ſuppoſe that the ſentiments of that writer could poſſibly be adopted by the conductor of this work. We have little doubt that "De Courcey," to whom the Letter was addreſſed, will take due notice of it.

Dr. Hales's Tenth Letter to Dr. Troy is unavoidably poſtponed till our next, as well as ſeveral other important communications.